The Will to Power

Attempt at a revaluation of All Values.
(Studies and Fragments.)

Notes written 1883-1888. Published in 1901.

Index
Selected Text

Book I: European Nihilism
I. Nihilism
II. History of European Nihilism
Book II: Critique of Highest Values Hitherto
I. Critique of Religion
1. Genesis of Religions
2. History of Christianity
3. Christian Ideals
II. Critique of Morality
1. Origin of Moral Valuations
2. The Herd
3. General Remarks on Morality
4. How Virtue is Made to Dominate
5. The Moral Ideal
A. Critique of Ideals
B. Critique of the "Good Man," the Saint, etc.
C. Disagreement of the So-Called Evil Qualities
D. Critique of the Words: Improvement, Perfecting, Elevation
6. Further Considerations for a Critique of Morality
III. Critique of Philosophy
1. General Observations
2. Critique of Greek Philosophy
3. Truth and Error of Philosophers
4. Further Considerations for a Critique of Philosophy
Book III: Principles of a New Valuation
I. The Will to Power as Knowledge
1. Method of Inquiry
2. The Epistemological Starting Point

3. Belief in the "Ego"
Biology of the Drive to Knowledge
5. Origin of Reason and Logic
6. Consciousness
7. Judgment. True-False
8. Against Causalism

9. Thing-in-Itself and Appearance
10. Metaphysical Need
11. Biological Value of Knowledge
12. Science
II. The Will to Power in Nature
1. The Mechanistic Interpretation of the World
2. The Will to Power as Life
A. The Organic Process
B. Man
3. Theory of the Will to Power and of Values
III. The Will to Power as Society and Individual
1. Society and State
2. The Individual
IV. The Will to Power as Art
Book IV: Discipline and Breeding
I. Order of Rank
1. The Doctrine of Order of Rank
2. The Strong and the Weak
3. The Noble Man
4. The Masters of the Earth
5. The Great Human Being
6. The Highest Man as Legislator of the Future
II. Dionysus
III. The Eternal Recurrence

PREFACE

(NOVEMBER 1887-MARCH 1888)

1.

Of what is great one must either be silent or speak with greatness. With greatness-that means cynically and with innocence.

2.

What I relate is the history of the next two centuries. I describe what is coming, what can no longer come differently: *the advent of nihilism.* This history can be related even now; for necessity itself is at work here. This future speaks even now in a hundred signs, this destiny announces itself everywhere; for this music of the future all ears are cocked even now. For some time now, our whole European culture has been moving as toward a catastrophe, with a tortured tension that is growing from decade to decade: restlessly, violently, headlong, like a river that wants to reach the end, that no longer reflects, that is afraid to reflect.

3.

He that speaks here, conversely, has done nothing so far but reflect: a philosopher and solitary by instinct, who has found his advantage in standing aside and outside, in patience, in procrastination, in staying behind; as a spirit of daring and experiment that has already lost its way once in every labyrinth of the future; as a soothsayer-bird spirit who *looks back* when relating what will come; as the first perfect nihilist of Europe who, however, has even now lived through the whole of nihilism, to the end, leaving it behind, outside himself.

4.

For one should make no mistake about the meaning of the title that this gospel of the future wants to bear. *"The Will to Power:* Attempt at a Revaluation of All Values"-in this formulation a countermovement finds expression, regarding both principle and task; a movement that in some future will take the place of this perfect nihilism-but presupposes it, logically and psychologically, and certainly can come only after and out of it. For why has the advent of nihilism become *necessary?* Because the values we have had hitherto thus

draw their final consequence; because nihilism represents the ultimate logical conclusion of our great values and ideals-because we must experience nihilism before we can find out what value these "values" really had.-We require, sometime, *new values.*

BOOK I
EUROPEAN NIHILISM
Toward an Outline
(1885-1886)

1.

Nihilism stands at the door: whence comes this uncanniest of all guests? Point of departure: it is an error to consider "social distress" or "physiological degeneration" or, worse, corruption, as the *cause* of nihilism. Ours is the most decent and compassionate age. Distress, whether of the soul, body, or intellect, cannot of itself give birth to nihilism (i.e., the radical repudiation of value, meaning, and desirability). Such distress always permits a variety of interpretations. Rather: it is in one particular interpretation, the Christian-moral one, that nihilism is rooted.

2.

The end of Christianity-at the hands of its own morality (which cannot be replaced), which turns against the Christian God (the sense of truthfulness, developed highly by Christianity, is nauseated by the falseness and mendaciousness of all Christian interpretations of the world and of history; rebound from "God is truth" to the fanatical faith "All is false"; Buddhism of *action*-).

3.

Skepticism regarding morality is what is decisive. The end of the moral interpretation of the world, which no longer has any sanction after it has tried to escape into some beyond, leads to nihilism. "Everything lacks meaning" (the untenability of one interpretation of the world, upon which a tremendous amount of energy has been lavished, awakens the suspicion that *all* interpretations of the world are false). Buddhistic tendency, yearning for Nothing. (Indian Buddhism is *not* the culmination of a thoroughly moralistic development; its nihilism is therefore full of morality that is not overcome: existence as punishment, existence construed as error, error thus as a punishment-a moral valuation.) Philosophical attempts to overcome the "moral God" (Hegel, pantheism). Overcoming popular ideals: the sage; the saint; the poet. The antagonism of "true" and "beautiful" and "good"-

4.

Against "meaninglessness" on the one hand, against moral value judgments on the other: to what extent has all science and philosophy so far been influenced by moral judgments? and won't this net us the hostility of science? Or an antiscientific mentality? Critique of Spinozism. Residues of Christian value judgments are found everywhere in socialistic and positivistic systems. A *critique of Christian morality* is still lacking.

5.

The nihilistic consequences of contemporary natural science (together with its attempts to escape into some beyond). The industry of its pursuit eventually leads to self-disintegration, opposition, an antiscientific mentality. Since Copernicus man has been rolling from the center toward X. [Cf. *Genealogy of Morals,* third essay, section 25.]

6.

The nihilistic consequences of the ways of thinking in politics and economics, where all "principles" are practically histrionic: the air of mediocrity, wretchedness, dishonesty, etc. Nationalism. Anarchism, etc. Punishment. The *redeeming* class and human being are lacking-the justifiers-

7.

The nihilistic consequences of historiography and of the *"practical* historians," i.e., the romantics. The position of art: its position in the modern world absolutely lacking in originality. Its decline into gloom. Goethe's allegedly Olympian stance.

8.

Art and the preparation of nihilism: romanticism (the conclusion of Wagner's *Nibelungen*).

I. Nihilism

2 (Spring-Fall 1887)

What does nihilism mean? *That the highest values devaluate themselves.* The aim is lacking; "why?" finds no answer.

3 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Radical nihilism is the conviction of an absolute untenability of existence when it comes to the highest values one recognizes; plus the realization that we lack the least right to posit a beyond or an in-itself of things that might be "divine" or morality incarnate.

This realization is a consequence of the cultivation of "truthfulness"-thus itself a consequence of the faith in morality.

4 (June 10, 1887)

What were the advantages of the Christian moral hypothesis?

1. It granted man an absolute value, as opposed to his smallness and accidental occurrence in the flux of becoming and passing away.
2. It served the advocates of God insofar as it conceded to the world, in spite of suffering and evil, the character of perfection-including "freedom": evil appeared full of meaning.
3. It posited that man had a *knowledge* of absolute values and thus *adequate knowledge* precisely regarding what is most important.
4. It prevented man from despising himself as man, from taking sides against life; from despairing of knowledge: it was a *means of preservation.*

In sum: morality was the great *antidote* against practical and theoretical *nihilism.*

5 (June 10, 1887)

But among the forces cultivated by morality was *truthfulness:* this eventually turned against morality, discovered its teleology, its partial perspective-and now the recognition of this inveterate mendaciousness that one despairs of shedding becomes a stimulant. Now we discover in ourselves needs implanted by centuries of moral interpretation-needs that now appear to us as needs for untruth; on the other hand, the value for which we endure life seems to hinge on these needs. This antagonism-*not* to esteem what we know, and not to be *allowed* any longer to esteem the lies we should like to tell ourselves-results in a process of dissolution.

6 (Spring-Fall 1887)

This is the *antinomy:*

Insofar as we believe in morality we pass sentence on existence.

7 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The supreme values in whose service man *should* live, especially when they were very hard on him and exacted a high price-these *social values* were erected over man to strengthen their voice, as if they were commands of God, as "reality," as the "true" world, as a hope and *future* world. Now that the shabby origin of these values is becoming clear, the universe seems to have lost value, seems "meaningless"-but that is only a *transitional stage.*

8 (1883-1888)

The nihilistic consequence (the belief in valuelessness) as a consequence of moral valuation: *everything egoistic has come to disgust us* (even though we realize the impossibility of the unegoistic); *what is necessary has come to disgust us* (even though we realize the impossibility of any *liberum arbitrium* [Free will.] or intelligible freedom"). We see that we cannot reach the sphere in which we have placed our values; but this does not by any means confer any value on that other sphere in which we live: on the contrary, we are *weary* because we have lost the main stimulus "In vain so far!"

9 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Pessimism as a preliminary form of nihilism.

10 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Pessimism as strength-in what? in the energy of its logic, as anarchism and nihilism, as analytic.

Pessimism as decline-in what? as growing effeteness, as a sort of cosmopolitan fingering, as *"tout comprendre"* [Understanding everything.] and historicism.

The critical tension: the extremes appear and become predominant.

11 (Spring-Fall 1887, rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

The logic of pessimism down to ultimate nihilism: what is at work in it? The idea of valuelessness, meaninglessness: to what extent moral valuations hide behind all other high values.

Conclusion: *Moral value judgments are ways of passing sentence, negations; morality is a way of turning one's back on the will to existence.*

Problem: *But what is morality?*

12 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Decline of Cosmological Values

(A)

Nihilism as a psychological state will have to be reached, *first,* when we have sought a "meaning" in all events that is not there: so the seeker eventually becomes discouraged. Nihilism, then, is the recognition of the long *waste* of strength, the agony of the "in vain," insecurity, the lack of any opportunity to recover and to regain composure-being ashamed in front of oneself, as if one had *deceived* oneself all too long.-This meaning could have been: the "fulfillment" of some highest ethical canon in all events, the moral world order; or the growth of love and harmony in the intercourse of beings; or the gradual approximation of a state of universal happiness; or even the development toward a state of universal annihilation-any goal at least constitutes some meaning. What all these notions have in common is that something is to be *achieved* through the process-and now one realizes that becoming aims at *nothing* and achieves *nothing*.-Thus, disappointment regarding an alleged aim of becoming as a cause of nihilism: whether regarding a specific aim or, universalized, the realization that all previous hypotheses about aims that concern the whole "evolution" are inadequate (man no longer the collaborator, let alone the center, of becoming).

Nihilism as a psychological state is reached, *secondly,* when one has posited a totality, a systematization, indeed any organization in all events, and underneath all events, and a soul that longs to admire and revere has wallowed in the idea of some supreme form of domination and administration (-if the soul be that of a logician, complete consistency and real dialectic are quite sufficient to reconcile it to everything). Some sort of unity, some form of "monism": this faith suffices to give man a deep feeling of standing in the context of, and being dependent on, some whole that is infinitely superior to him, and he sees himself as a mode of the deity.-"The well-being of the universal demands the devotion of the individual"-but behold, there is no such universal! At bottom, man has lost the faith in his own value when no infinitely valuable whole works through him; i.e., he conceived such a whole in order *to be able to believe in his own value.*

Nihilism as psychological state has yet a *third* and *last* form.

Given these two insights, that becoming has no goal and that underneath all becoming there is no grand unity in which the individual could immerse himself completely as in an element of supreme value, an escape remains: to pass sentence on this whole world of becoming as a deception and to invent a world beyond it, a *true* world. But as soon as man finds out how that world is fabricated solely from psychological needs, and how he has absolutely no right to it, the last form of nihilism comes into being: it includes disbelief in any metaphysical world and forbids itself any belief in a *true* world. Having reached this standpoint, one grants the reality of becoming as the *only* reality, forbids oneself every kind of clandestine access to afterworlds and false divinities-but *cannot endure this world though one does not want to deny it.*

What has happened, at bottom? The feeling of valuelessness was reached with the realization that the overall character of existence may not be interpreted by means of the concept of "aim," the concept of "unity," or the concept of "truth." Existence has no goal or end; any comprehensive unity in the plurality of events is lacking: the character of existence is not "true," is *false.* One simply lacks any reason for convincing oneself that there is a *true* world. Briefly: the categories "aim," "unity," "being" which we used to project some value into the world-we *pull out* again; so the world looks *valueless.*

(B)

Suppose we realize how the world may no longer be interpreted in terms of these three categories, and that the world begins to become valueless for us after this insight: then we have to ask about the sources of our faith in these three categories. Let us try if it is not possible to give up our faith in them. Once we have devaluated these three categories, the demonstration that they cannot be applied to the universe is no longer any reason for devaluating the universe.

Conclusion: The faith in the categories of reason is the cause of nihilism. We have measured the value of the world according to categories *that refer to a purely fictitious world.*

Final conclusion: All the values by means of which we have tried so far to render the world estimable for ourselves and which then proved inapplicable and therefore devaluated the world-all these values are, psychologically considered, the results of certain perspectives of utility, designed to maintain and increase human constructs of domination-and they have been falsely *projected* into the essence of things. What we find here is still the *hyperbolic naiveté* of man: positing himself as the meaning and measure of the value of things.

13 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Nihilism represents a pathological transitional stage (what is pathological is the tremendous generalization, the inference that there is no meaning at all): whether the productive forces are not yet strong enough, or whether decadence still hesitates and has not yet invented its remedies.

Presupposition of this hypothesis: that there is no truth, that there is no absolute nature of things nor a "thing-in-itself." This, too, is merely nihilism-even the most extreme nihilism. It places the value of things precisely in the lack of any reality corresponding to these values and in their being merely a symptom of strength on the part of the value-positers, a simplification for the sake of life.

14 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Values and their changes are related to increases in the power of those positing the values.
The measure of *unbelief,* of permitted "freedom of the spirit" as *an expression of an increase in power.*
"Nihilism" an ideal of the highest degree of powerfulness of spirit, the over-richest life-partly destructive, partly ironic.

15 (Spring-Fall 1887)

What is a *belief?* How does it originate? Every belief is a considering-something-true.
The most extreme form of nihilism would be the view that *every* belief, every considering-something-true, is necessarily false because there simply is no *true world.* Thus: a *perspectival appearance* whose origin lies in us (in so far as we continually *need* a narrower, abbreviated, simplified world).
-That it is the measure of strength to what extent we can admit to ourselves, without perishing, the merely *apparent* character, the necessity of lies.
To this extent, nihilism, as the denial of a truthful world, of being, might be *a divine way of thinking.*

16 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

If we are "disappointed," it is at least not regarding life: rather we are now facing up to all kinds of "desiderata." With scornful wrath we contemplate what are called "ideals"; we despise ourselves only because there are moments when we cannot subdue that absurd impulse that is called "idealism." The influence of too much coddling is stronger than the wrath of the disappointed.

17 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. 1888)

To what extent Schopenhauer's nihilism still follows from the same ideal that created Christian theism.-One felt so certain about the highest desiderata, the highest values, the highest perfection that the philosophers assumed this as an absolute certainty, as if it were a priori: "God" at the apex as a *given truth.* "To become as God," "to be absorbed into God"-for thousands of years these were the most naive and convincing desiderata (but what convinces is not necessarily true-it is merely convincing: a note for asses).
One has unlearned the habit of conceding to this posited ideal the reality of a person; one has become atheistic. But has the ideal itself been renounced?-At bottom, the last metaphysicians still seek in it true "reality," the "thing-in-itself" compared to which everything else is merely apparent. It is their dogma that our apparent world, being so plainly *not* the expression of this ideal, cannot be "true"-and that, at bottom, it does not even lead us back to that metaphysical world as its cause. The unconditional, representing that highest perfection, cannot possibly be the ground of all that is conditional. Schopenhauer wanted it otherwise and therefore had to conceive of this metaphysical ground as the opposite of the ideal-as "evil, blind will": that way it could be that "which appears," that which reveals itself in the world of appearances. But even so he did not renounce the absoluteness of the ideal-he sneaked by.-
(Kant considered the hypothesis of "intelligible freedom" necessary in order to acquit the *ens perfectum* [Perfect being.] of responsibility for the world's being such-and-such-in short, to account for evil and ills: a scandalous bit of logic for a philosopher.-)

18 (1883-1888)

The most universal sign of the modern age: man has lost *dignity* in his own eyes to an incredible extent. For a long time the center and tragic hero of existence in general; then at least intent on proving himself closely related to the decisive and essentially valuable side of existence-like all metaphysicians who wish to cling to the *dignity of man,* with their faith that moral values are cardinal values. Those who have abandoned God cling that much more firmly to the faith in morality.

19 (1883-1888)

Every purely moral value system (that of Buddhism, for example) ends in nihilism: this to be expected in Europe. One still hopes to get along with a moralism without religious background: but that necessarily leads to nihilism.-In religion the constraint is lacking to consider *ourselves* as value-positing.

20 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The nihilistic question "for what?" is rooted in the old habit of supposing that the goal must be put up, given, demanded *from outside*-by some *superhuman authority.* Having unlearned faith in that, one still follows the old habit and seeks *another* authority that can *speak unconditionally* and *command* goals and tasks. The authority of *conscience* now steps up front (the more emancipated one is from theology, the more imperativistic morality becomes) to compensate for the loss of a *personal* authority. Or the authority of *reason.* Or the *social instinct* (the herd). Or *history* with an immanent spirit and a goal within, so one can

entrust oneself to it. One wants to get around the will, the willing of a goal, the risk of positing a goal *for oneself;* one wants to rid oneself of the responsibility (one would accept fatalism). Finally, *happiness*-and, with a touch of Tartuffe, the *happiness of the greatest number.*

One says to oneself:

1. a definite goal is not necessary at all,
2. cannot possibly be anticipated.

Just now when the greatest strength of will would be necessary, it is weakest and least confident. Absolute mistrust regarding the organizing strength of the will for the whole. [In the margin: "Individual goals and their conflict; collective goals versus individual ones. *Everybody merely a partisan,* including the philosophers.]

21 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. 1888)

The perfect nihilist.-The nihilist's eye idealizes in the direction of ugliness and is unfaithful to his memories: it allows them to drop, lose their leaves; it does not guard them against the corpselike pallor that weakness pours out over what is distant and gone. And what he does not do for himself, he also does not do for the whole past of mankind: he lets it drop.

22 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Nihilism. It is *ambiguous:*

A. Nihilism as a sign of increased power of the spirit: as *active* nihilism.
B. Nihilism as decline and recession of the power of the spirit: as *passive* nihilism.

23 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Nihilism as a *normal* condition.

It can be a sign of strength: the spirit may have grown so strong that previous goals ("convictions," articles of faith) have become incommensurate (for a faith generally expresses the constraint of conditions of existence, submission to the authority of circumstances under which one flourishes, grows, gains power). Or a sign of the lack of strength to posit for oneself, productively, a goal, a why, a faith.

It reaches its maximum of relative strength as a violent force of destruction-as active nihilism.

Its opposite: the weary nihilism that no longer attacks; its most famous form, Buddhism; a passive nihilism, a sign of weakness. The strength of the spirit may be worn out, exhausted, so that previous goals and values have become incommensurate and no longer are believed; so that the synthesis of values and goals (on which every strong culture rests) dissolves and the individual values war against each other: disintegration-and whatever refreshes, heals, calms, numbs emerges into the foreground in various disguises, religious or moral, or political, or aesthetic, etc.

24 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Nihilism does not only contemplate the "in vain!" nor is it merely the belief that everything deserves to perish: one helps to destroy.-This is, if you will, illogical; but the nihilist does not believe that one needs to be logical.-It is the condition of strong spirits and wills, and these do not find it possible to stop with the No of "judgment": their nature demands the No of the deed. The reduction to nothing by judgment is seconded by the reduction to nothing by hand.

25 (Spring-Fall 1887)

On the genesis of the nihilist.-It is only late that one musters the courage for what one really knows. That I have hitherto been a thorough-going nihilist, I have admitted to myself only recently: the energy and radicalism with which I advanced as a nihilist deceived me about this basic fact. When one moves toward a goal it seems impossible that "goal-lessness as such" is the principle of our faith.

26 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The pessimism of active energy: the question "for what?" after a terrible struggle, even victory. That something is a hundred times more important than the question of whether we feel well or not: basic instinct of all strong natures-and consequently also whether others feel well or not. In sum, that we have a goal for which one does not hesitate to offer human sacrifices, to risk every danger, to take upon oneself whatever is bad and worst: the *great passion.*

27 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Causes of nihilism: 1. The higher species is lacking, i.e., those whose inexhaustible fertility and power keep up the faith in man. (One should recall what one owes to Napoleon: almost all of the higher hopes of this century.)

2. The lower species ("herd," "mass," "society") unlearns modesty and blows up its needs into cosmic and metaphysical values. In this way the whole of existence is vulgarized: in so far as the mass is dominant it bullies the exceptions, so they lose their faith in themselves and become nihilists.

All attempts to think up higher types failed ("romanticism"; the artist, the philosopher; against Carlyle's attempt to ascribe to them the highest moral values).

The resistance to higher types as a result.
Decline and insecurity of all higher types. The fight against the genius ("folk poetry," etc.). Pity for the lowly and suffering as a measure for the height of a soul.
The philosopher is lacking who interprets the deed and does not merely transpose it.

28 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Main proposition. How *complete nihilism* is the necessary consequence of the ideals entertained hitherto.
Incomplete nihilism; its forms: we live in the midst of it.
Attempts to escape nihilism without revaluating our values so far: they produce the opposite, make the problem more acute.

29 (1883-1888)

The ways of self-narcotization.-Deep down: not knowing whither. *Emptiness.* Attempt to get over it by intoxication: intoxication as music; intoxication as cruelty in the tragic enjoyment of the destruction of the noblest; intoxication as blind enthusiasm for single human beings or ages (as hatred, etc.).-Attempt to work blindly as an instrument of science: opening one's eyes to the many small enjoyments; e.g., also in the quest of knowledge (modesty toward oneself); resignation to generalizing about oneself, a pathos; mysticism, the voluptuous enjoyment of eternal emptiness; art "for its own sake" (*"le fait"*) and "pure knowledge" as narcotic states of disgust with oneself; some kind or other of continual work, or of some stupid little fanaticism; a medley of all means, sickness owing to general immoderation (debauchery kills enjoyment).
1. Weakness of the will as a result.
2. Extreme pride and the humiliation of petty weakness *felt* in contrast.

30 (Nov. 1887-March 1888; rev. 1888)

The time has come when we have to pay for having been Christians for two thousand years: we are losing the center of gravity by virtue of which we lived; we are lost for a while. Abruptly we plunge into the opposite valuations, with all the energy that such an extreme overvaluation of man has generated in man.
Now everything is false through and through, mere "words," chaotic, weak, or extravagant:
a. one attempts a kind of this-worldly solution, but in the same sense-that of the eventual triumph of truth, love, and justice (socialism: "equality of the person");
b. one also tries to hold on to the moral ideal (with the pre-eminence of what is un-egoistic, self-denial, negation of the win);
c. one tries to hold on even to the "beyond"-even if only as some antilogical "x"-but one immediately interprets it in such a way that some sort of old-fashioned metaphysical comfort can be derived from it;
d. one tries to find in events an old-fashioned divine governance-an order of things that rewards, punishes, educates, and betters;
e. one still believes in good and evil and experiences the triumph of the good and the annihilation of evil as a task (that is English; typical case: the flathead John Stuart Mill);
f. contempt for what is "natural," for desire, for the ego: attempt to understand even the highest spirituality and art as the consequence of depersonalization and as *désintéressement;*
g. the church is still permitted to obtrude into all important experiences and main points of individual life to hallow them and give them a higher meaning: we still have the "Christian state," "Christian marriage"- [This sentence breaks off, but a few other phrases follow: "(1) the 'immortal soul'"; the eternal value of the 'person'-(2) the solution, the judgment the evaluation in the 'beyond'-(3) moral values as the supreme values, the 'salvation of the soul' as one's cardinal interest-(4) 'sin,' 'earthly,' 'flesh,' 'appetites,' stigmatized as 'world.'"]

31 (1884)

There have been more thoughtful and thought-addicted ages than ours: ages, e.g., like that in which the Buddha appeared, when after centuries of quarrels among sects the people themselves were as deeply lost in the ravines of philosophic doctrines as European nations were at times in the subtleties of religious dogmas. Surely, one should not let "literature" and the press seduce us to think well of the "spirit" of our time: the existence of millions of spiritists and a Christianity that goes in for gymnastics of that gruesome ugliness that characterizes all English inventions are more instructive.
European pessimism is still in its early stages-bears witness against itself: it still lacks that tremendous, yearning rigidity of expression in which the Nothing is reflected, once found in India; it is still far too contrived and too little "organic"-too much a pessimism of scholars and poets: I mean, much of it is excogitated and invented, is "created" and not a "cause."

32 (Summer-Fall 1888)

Critique of pessimism to date.-Resistance to eudaemonistic considerations as the last reduction to the question: what does it *mean?* The reduction of growing gloom.-

Our pessimism: the world does not have the value we thought it had. Our faith itself has so increased our desire for knowledge that today we have to say this. Initial result: it seems worth less; that is how it is experienced initially. It is only in this sense that we are pessimists; i.e., in our determination to admit this revaluation to ourselves without any reservation, and to stop telling ourselves tales-lies-the old way.
That is precisely how we find the pathos that impels us to seek *new values.* In sum: the world might be far more valuable than we used to believe; we must see through the naiveté of our ideals, and while we thought that we accorded it the highest interpretation, we may not even have given our human existence a moderately fair value.
What has been *deified?* The value instincts in the community (that which made possible its continued existence).
What has been *slandered?* That which *set apart* the higher men from the lower, the desires that create clefts.

33 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Causes of the advent of pessimism:
1. that the most powerful desires of life that have the most future have hitherto been slandered, so a curse weighs on life;
2. that the growing courage and integrity and the bolder mistrust that now characterize man comprehend that these instincts are inseparable from life, and one therefore turns against life;
3. that only the most mediocre, who have no feeling at all for this conflict, flourish while the higher kind miscarries and, as a product of degeneration, invites antipathy-that the mediocre on the other hand, when they pose as the goal and meaning, arouse indignation (that nobody is able any more to answer any "for what?");
4. that diminution, sensitivity to pain, restlessness, haste, and hustling grow continually-that it becomes easier and easier to recognize this whole commotion, this so-called "civilization," and that the individual, faced with this tremendous machinery, loses courage and submits.

34 (1885-1886)

Modern pessimism is an expression of the uselessness of the *modern* world-not of the world of existence.

35 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The "predominance of suffering over pleasure" or the opposite (*hedonism*): these two doctrines are already signposts to nihilism.
For in both of these cases no ultimate meaning is posited except the appearance of pleasure or displeasure.
But that is how a kind of man speaks that no longer dares to posit a will, a purpose, a meaning: for any healthier kind of man the value of life is certainly not measured by the standard of these trifles. And suffering might predominate, and in spite of that a powerful will might exist, a Yes to life, a need for this predominance.
"Life is not worthwhile"; "resignation"; "why the tears?"- a weakly and sentimental way of thinking. *"Un monstre gai vaut mieux qu'un sentimental ennuyeux."* ["A gay monster is worth more than a sentimental bore."]

36 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The philosophical nihilist is convinced that all that happens is meaningless and in vain; and that there ought not to be anything meaningless and in vain. But whence this: there ought not to be? From where does one get *this* "meaning," *this* standard?-At bottom, the nihilist thinks that the sight of such a bleak, useless existence makes a philosopher feel *dissatisfied,* bleak, desperate. Such an insight goes against our finer sensibility as philosophers. It amounts to the absurd valuation: to have any right to be, the character of existence *would have to give the philosopher pleasure.*-
Now it is easy to see that pleasure and displeasure can only be *means* in the course of events: the question remains whether we are at all able to see the "meaning," the "aim," whether the question of meaninglessness or its opposite is not insoluble for us.-

37 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The development of pessimism into nihilism.-Denaturalization of values. Scholasticism of values. Detached and idealistic, values, instead of dominating and guiding action, turn against action and condemn it.
Opposites replace natural degrees and ranks. Hatred against the order of rank. Opposites suit a plebeian age because easier to comprehend.
The repudiated world versus an artificially built "true, valuable" one.-Finally: one discovers of what material one has built the "true world": and now all one has left is the repudiated world, and one adds this supreme disappointment to the reasons why it deserves to be repudiated.
At this point nihilism is reached: all one has left are the values that pass judgment-nothing else.
Here the problem of strength and weakness originates:

1. The weak perish of it;
2. those who are stronger destroy what does not perish;
3. those who are strongest overcome the values that pass judgment.
In sum this constitutes the tragic age.

38 (1883-1888)

Recently much mischief has been done with an accidental and in every way unsuitable word: everywhere "pessimism" is discussed, and the question is debated whether pessmism or optimism is right, as if there must be answers to that.
One fails to see, although it could hardly be more obvious, that pessimism is not a problem but a symptom, that the name should be replaced by "nihilism," that the question whether not-to-be is better than to be is itself a disease, a sign of decline, an idiosyncrasy.
The nihilistic movement is merely the expression of physiological decadence.

39 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

To be comprehended: That every kind of decay and sickness has continually helped to form overall value judgments; that decadence has actually gained predominance in the value judgments that have become accepted; that we not only have to fight against the consequences of all present misery of degeneration, but that all *previous* decadence is still residual, i.e., survives. Such a total aberration of mankind from its basic instincts, such a total decadence of value judgments-that is the question mark par excellence, the real riddle that the animal "man" poses for the philosopher.

40 (March-June 1888)

The concept of decadence.-Waste, decay, elimination need not be condemned: they are necessary consequences of life, of the growth of life. The phenomenon of decadence is as necessary as any increase and advance of life: one is in no position to abolish it. Reason demands, on the contrary, that we do justice to it.
It is a disgrace for all socialist systematizers that they suppose there could be circumstances-social combinations-in which vice, disease, prostitution, distress would no longer grow.-But that means condemning life.-A society is not free to remain young. And even at the height of its strength it has to form refuse and waste materials. The more energetically and boldly it advances, the richer it will be in failures and deformities, the closer to decline.-Age is not abolished by means of institutions. Neither is disease. Nor vice.

41 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Basic insight regarding the nature of decadence: *its supposed causes are its consequences.*
This changes the whole perspective of *moral problems.*
The whole moral struggle against vice, luxury, crime, even disease, appears a naiveté and superfluous: there is no "improvement" (against repentance).
Decadence itself is nothing *to be fought:* it is absolutely necessary and belongs to every age and every people. What should be fought vigorously is the contagion of the healthy parts of the organism.
Is this being done? The *opposite* is done. Precisely that is attempted in the name of *humanity.*
-How are the supreme values held so far, related to this basic biological question? Philosophy, religion, morality, art, etc.
(The cure: e.g., *militarism,* beginning with Napoleon who considered civilization his natural enemy.)

42 (March-June 1888)

First principle:
The supposed causes of degeneration are its consequences.
But the supposed remedies of degeneration are also mere palliatives against some of its effects: the "cured" are merely one type of the degenerates.
Consequences of decadence: vice-the addiction to vice; sickness-sickliness; crime-criminality; celibacy-sterility; hystericism-weakness of the will; alcoholism; pessimism; anarchism; libertinism (also of the spirit). The slanderers, underminers, doubters, destroyers.

43 (March-June 1888)

On the concept of decadence.
1. Skepticism is a consequence of decadence, as is libertinism of the spirit.
2. The corruption of morals is a consequence of decadence (weakness of the will, need for strong stimuli).
3. Attempted cures, psychological and moral, do not change the course of decadence, do not arrest it, are physiologically *naught:*
Insight into the great nullity of these presumptuous "reactions"; they are forms of narcotization against certain terrible consequences; they do not eliminate the morbid element; often they are heroic attempts to annul the man of decadence and to realize the minimum of his harmfulness.

4. Nihilism is no cause but merely the logical result of decadence.
5. The "good" and "bad" man are merely two types of decadence: in all basic phenomena they agree.
6. The social question is a consequence of decadence.
7. Sicknesses, especially those affecting nerves and head, are signs that the defensive strength of the strong natures is lacking; precisely this is suggested by irritability, so pleasure and displeasure become foreground problems.

44 (Spring-Summer 1888)

[In the margin: "On the History of Nihilism."]

Most general types of decadence:
1. Believing one chooses remedies, one chooses in fact that which hastens exhaustion; Christianity is an example (to name the greatest example of such an aberration of the instincts); "progress" is another instance.-
2. One loses one's power of resistance against stimuli-and comes to be at the mercy of accidents: one coarsens and enlarges one's experiences tremendously-"depersonalization," disintegration of the will; example: one whole type of morality, the altruistic one which talks much of pity-and is distinguished by the weakness of the personality, so that it is sounded, too, and like an overstimulated string vibrates continually-an extreme irritability.-
3. One confuses cause and effect: one fails to understand decadence as a physiological condition and mistakes its consequences for the real cause of the indisposition; example: all of religious morality.-
4. One longs for a condition in which one no longer suffers: life is actually experienced as the ground of ills; one esteems unconscious states, without feeling, (sleep, fainting) as incomparably more valuable than conscious ones; from this a method-

45 (March-June 1888)

On the hygiene of the "weak."-Everything done in weakness fails. Moral: do nothing. Only there is the hitch that precisely the strength to suspend activity, *not* to react, is sickest of all under the influence of weakness: one never reacts more quickly and blindly than when one should not react at all.-
A strong nature manifests itself by waiting and postponing any reaction: it is as much characterized by a certain *adiaphoria* [Indifference.] as weakness is by an involuntary countermovement and the suddenness and inevitability of "action."-The will is weak-and the prescription to avoid stupidities would be to have a strong will and to do *nothing.*-*Contradictio.*-A kind of self-destruction; the instinct of preservation is compromised.-The weak harm themselves.-That is the type of decadence.-
In fact, we find a tremendous amount of reflection about practices that would lead to impassability. The instinct is on the right track insofar as doing nothing is more expedient than doing something.-
All the practices of the orders, the solitary philosophers, the fakirs are inspired by the right value standard that a certain kind of man cannot benefit himself more than by preventing himself as much as possible from acting.-
Means of relief: absolute obedience, machinelike activity, avoidance of people and things that would demand instant decisions and actions.

46 (March-June 1888)

Weakness of the will: that is a metaphor that can prove misleading. For there is no will, and consequently neither a strong nor a weak will. [See 84.] The multitude and disgregation of impulses and the lack of any systematic order among them result in a "weak will"; their coordination under a single predominant impulse results in a "strong will": in the first case it is the oscillation and the lack of gravity; in the latter, the precision and clarity of the direction.

47 (March-June 1888)

What is inherited is not the sickness but *sickliness:* the lack of strength to resist the danger of infections, etc., the broken resistance; *morally* speaking, resignation and meekness in face of the enemy.
I have asked myself if all the supreme values of previous philosophy, morality, and religion could not be compared to the values of the weakened, the *mentally* ill, and *neurasthenics:* in a milder form, they represent the same ills.-
It is the value of all morbid states that they show us under a magnifying glass certain states that are normal-but not easily visible when normal.-
Health and sickness are not essentially different, as the ancient physicians and some practitioners even today suppose. One must not make of them distinct principles or entities that fight over the living organism and turn it into their arena. That is silly nonsense and chatter that is no good any longer. In fact, there are only differences in degree between these two kinds of existence: the exaggeration, the disproportion, the nonharmony of the normal phenomena constitute the pathological state (Claude Bernard).

Just as "*evil*" can be considered as exaggeration, disharmony, disproportion, "*the good*" may be a *protective diet* against the danger of exaggeration, disharmony, and disproportion.
Hereditary weakness as the *dominant* feeling: cause of the supreme values.
N.B. One *wants* weakness: why? Usually because one is *necessarily* weak.
-*Weakness* as a *task:* weakening the desires, the feelings of pleasure and displeasure, the will to power, to a sense of pride, to want to have and have more; weakening as meekness; weakening as faith; weakening as aversion and shame in the face of everything natural, as negation of life, as sickness and habitual weakness-weakening as the renunciation of revenge, of resistance, of enmity and wrath.
The error in treatment: one does not want to fight weakness with a *système fortifiant,* [A method that strengthens.] but rather with a kind of justification and moralization; i.e., with an *interpretation*.-
-Two totally different states confounded: e.g., the *calm of strength,* which is essentially forbearance from reaction (type of the gods whom nothing moves)-and the *calm of exhaustion,* rigidity to the point of anesthesia. All philosophic-ascetic procedures aim at the second, but really intend the former-for they attribute predicates to the attained state as if a divine state had been attained.

48 (March-June 1888)

The most dangerous misunderstanding.-One concept apparently permits no confusion or ambiguity: that of *exhaustion.* Exhaustion can be acquired or inherited-in any case it changes the aspect of things, the *value of things*.-
As opposed to those who, from the fullness they represent and feel, involuntarily *give* to things and see them fuller, more powerful, and pregnant with future-who at least are able to bestow something-the exhausted diminish and botch all they see-they impoverish the value: they are harmful.-
About this no mistake seems possible: yet history contains the gruesome fact that the exhausted have always been mistaken for the fullest-and the fullest for the most harmful.
Those poor in life, the weak, impoverish life; those rich in life, the strong, enrich it. The first are parasites of life; the second give presents to it.-How is it possible to confound these two?
When the exhausted appeared with the gesture of the highest activity and energy (when degeneration effected an excess of spiritual and nervous discharge), they were mistaken for the rich. They excited fear.-
The cult of the *fool* is always the cult of those rich in life, the powerful. The fanatic, the possessed, the religious epileptic, all eccentrics have been experienced as the highest types of power: as divine.
This kind of strength that excites *fear* was considered preeminently divine: here was the origin of authority; here one interpreted, heard, sought wisdom.-This led to the development, almost everywhere, of a *will* to "deify," i.e., a will to the typical degeneration of spirit, body, and nerves: an attempt to find the way to this higher level of being. To make oneself sick, mad, to provoke the symptoms of derangement and ruin-that was taken for becoming stronger, more superhuman, more terrible, wiser. One thought that in this way one became so rich in power that one could give from one's fullness. Wherever one adored one sought one who could give.
Here the experience of intoxication proved misleading. This increases the feeling of power in the highest degree-therefore, naively judged, power itself. On the highest rung of power one placed the most intoxicated, the ecstatic. (-There are two sources of intoxication: the over-great fullness of life and a state of pathological nourishment of the brain.)

49 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Acquired, not inherited, exhaustion: (1) Inadequate nourishment, often from ignorance about nourishment; e.g., among scholars. (2) Erotic precociousness: the curse in particular of French youth, above all in Paris, who emerge into the world from their *lycées* botched and soiled and never free themselves again from the chain of contemptible inclinations, ironical and disdainful toward themselves-galley slaves with all refinements (incidentally, in most cases already a symptom of the decadence of race and family, like all hypersensitivity; also the contagion of the milieu-to let oneself be determined by one's environment is decadent). (3) Alcoholism-not the instinct but the habit, the stupid imitation, the cowardly or vain assimilation to a dominant regime:
What a blessing a Jew is among Germans! How much dullness, how blond the head, how blue the eye; the lack of *esprit* in face, word, posture; the lazy stretching-oneself, the German need for a good rest-not prompted by overwork but by the disgusting stimulation and overstimulation through alcoholica.-

50 (1888)

Theory of exhaustion.-Vice, the mentally ill (resp., the artists-), the criminals, the anarchists-these are not the oppressed classes but the scum of previous society of all classes.-

Realizing that all our classes are permeated by these elements, we understand that modern society is no "society," no "body," but a sick conglomerate of chandalas-a society that no longer has the strength to *excrete.*

To what extent sickliness, owing to the symbiosis of centuries, goes much deeper:
modern virtue,

modern spirituality, } as forms of sickness.

our science

51 (March-June 1888)

The state of corruption.-To understand how all forms of corruption belong together, without forgetting the Christian corruption (Pascal as type) as well as the socialist-communist corruption (a consequence of the Christian-from the point of view of the natural sciences, the socialists' conception of the highest society is the lowest in the order of rank); also the "beyond" corruption: as if outside the actual world, that of becoming, there were another world of being.

Here no terms are permissible: here one has to eradicate, annihilate, wage war; everywhere the Christian-nihilistic value standard still has to be pulled up and fought under every mask; e.g., in present-day sociology, in present-day music, in present-day pessimism (all of them forms of the Christian value ideal).

Either the one is true or the other: true here means elevating the type of man.

The priest, the shepherd of souls, as objectionable forms of existence. All of education to date, helpless, untenable, without center of gravity, stained by the contradiction of values.

52 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Nature is not immoral when it has no pity for the degenerate: on the contrary, the growth of physiological and moral ills among mankind is the consequence of a pathological and unnatural morality. The sensibility of the majority of men is pathological and unnatural.

Why is it that mankind is corrupt morally and physiologically?-The body perishes when an organ is altered. The right of altruism cannot be derived from physiology; nor can the right to help and to an equality of lots: these are prizes for the degenerate and underprivileged.

There is no solidarity in a society in which there are sterile, unproductive, and destructive elements-which, incidentally? will have descendants even more degenerate than they are themselves.

53 (March-June 1888)

Even the ideals of science can be deeply, yet completely unconsciously influenced by decadence: our entire sociology is proof of that. The objection to it is that from experience it knows only the form of the decay of society, and inevitably it takes its own instincts of decay for the norms of sociological judgment.

In these norms the life that is declining in present-day Europe formulates its social ideals: one cannot tell them from the ideals of old races that have outlived themselves.-

The *herd instinct,* then-a power that has now become sovereign-is something totally different from the instinct of an *aristocratic society:* and the value of the *units* determines the significance of the sum.-Our entire sociology simply does not know any other instinct than that of the herd, i.e., that of the *sum of zeroes*-where every zero has "equal rights," where it is virtuous to be zero.-

The valuation that is today applied to the different forms of society is entirely identical with that which assigns a higher value to peace than to war: but this judgment is antibiological, is itself a fruit of the decadence of life.-Life is a consequence of war, society itself a means to war.-As a biologist, Mr. Herbert Spencer is a decadent; as a moralist, too (he considers the triumph of altruism a desideratum! ! !).

54 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

It is my good fortune that after whole millennia of error and confusion I have rediscovered the way that leads to a Yes and a No.

I teach the No to all that makes weak-that exhausts.

I teach the Yes to all that strengthens, that stores up strength, that justifies the feeling of strength.

So far one has taught neither the one nor the other: virtue has been taught, mortification of the self, pity, even the negation of life. All these are the values of the exhausted.

Prolonged reflection on the physiology of exhaustion forced me to ask to what extent the judgments of the exhausted had penetrated the world of values.

My result was as surprising as possible, even for me who was at home in many a strange world: I found that all of the supreme value judgments-all that have come to dominate mankind, at least that part that has become tame-can be derived from the judgments of the exhausted.

Under the holiest names I pulled up destructive tendencies; one has called God what weakens, teaches weakness, infects with weakness.-I found that the "good man" is one of the forms in which decadence aflirms itself.
That virtue of which Schopenhauer still taught that it is the supreme, the only virtue, and the basis of all virtues-precisely pity I recognized as more dangerous than any vice. To cross as a matter of principle selection in the species and its purlfication of refuse-that has so far been called virtue *par excellence.*-
One should respect fatality-that fatality that says to the weak: perish!-
One has called it God-that one resisted fatality, that one corrupted mankind and made it rot.-One should not use the name of God in vain.-
The race is corrupted-not by its vices but by its ignorance; it is corrupted because it did not recognize exhaustion as exhaustion: mistakes about physiological states are the source of all ills.-
Virtue is our greatest misunderstanding.
Problem: How did the exhausted come to make the laws about values? Put differently: How did those come to power who are the last.-How did the instinct of the human animal come to stand on its head?-

55 (June 10, 1887)

Extreme positions are not succeeded by moderate ones but by extreme positions of the opposite kind. Thus the belief in the absolute immorality of nature, in aim- and meaninglessness, is the psychologically necessary affect once the belief in God and an essentially moral order becomes untenable. Nihilism appears at that point, not that the displeasure at existence has become greater than before but because one has come to mistrust any "meaning" in suffering, indeed in existence. One interpretation has collapsed; but because it was considered *the* interpretation it now seems as if there were no meaning at all in existence, as if everything were in vain.

*

That this "in vain" constitutes the character of present-day nihilism remains to be shown. The mistrust of our previous valuations grows until it becomes the question: "Are not all 'values' lures that draw out the comedy without bringing it closer to a solution?" Duration "in vain," without end or aim, is the most paralyzing idea, particularly when one understands that one is being fooled and yet lacks the power not to be fooled.

*

Let us think this thought in its most terrible form: existence as it is, without meaning or aim, yet recurring inevitably without any finale of nothingness: "*the eternal recurrence.*" This is the most extreme form of nihilism: the nothing (the "meaningless"), eternally!
The European form of Buddhism: the energy of knowledge and strength compels this belief. It is the most *scientifiic* of all possible hypotheses. We deny end goals: if existence had one it would have to have been reached.

*

So one understands that an antithesis to pantheism is attempted here: for "everything perfect, divine, eternal" also compels a faith in the "eternal recurrence." Question: does morality make impossible this pantheistic affirmation of all things, too? At bottom, it is only the moral god that has been overcome. Does it make sense to conceive a god "beyond good and evil"? Would a pantheism in this sense be possible? Can we remove the idea of a goal from the process and then affirm the process in spite of this?-This would be the case if something were attained at every moment within this process-and always the same. Spinoza reached such an affirmative position in so far as every moment has a logical necessity, and with his basic instinct, which was logical, he felt a sense of triumph that the world should be constituted that way.

*

But his case is only a single case. Every basic character trait that is encountered at the bottom of every event, that finds expression in every event, would have to lead every individual who experienced it as his own basic character trait to welcome every moment of universal existence with a sense of triumph. The crucial point would be that one experienced this basic character trait in oneself as good, valuable-with pleasure.

*

It was morality that protected life against despair and the leap into nothing, among men and classes who were violated and oppressed by *men:* for it is the experience of being powerless against men, not against nature, that generates the most desperate embitterment against existence. Morality treated the violent despots, the doers of violence, the "masters" in general as the enemies against whom the common man must be protected, which means first of all encouraged and strengthened. Morality consequently taught men to hate and despise most profoundly what is the basic character trait of those who rule: their will to power. To abolish, deny, and dissolve this morality-that would mean looking at the best-hated drive with an opposite

feeling and valuation. If the suffering and oppressed lost the faith that they have the right to despise the will to power, they would enter the phase of hopeless despair. This would be the case if this trait were essential to life and it could be shown that even in this will to morality this very "will to power" were hidden, and even this hatred and contempt were still a will to power. The oppressed would come to see that they were on the same plain with the oppressors, without prerogative, without higher rank.

*

Rather the opposite! There is nothing to life that has value, except the degree of power-assuming that life itself is the will to power. Morality guarded the underprivileged against nihilism by assigning to each an infinite value, a metaphysical value, and by placing each in an order that did not agree with the worldly order of rank and power: it taught resignation, meekness, etc. Supposipg that the faith in this morality would perish, then the underprivileged would no longer have their comfort-and they would perish.

*

This perishing takes the form of self-destruction-the instinctive selection of that which must destroy. Symptoms of this self-destruction of the underprivileged: self-vivisection, poisoning, intoxication, romanticism, above all the instinctive need for actions that turn the powerful into mortal enemies (as it were, one breeds one's own hangmen); the will to destruction as the will of a still deeper instinct, the instinct of self-destruction, the will for nothingness.

*

Nihilism as a symptom that the underprivileged have no comfort left; that they destroy in order to be destroyed; that without morality they no longer have any reason to "resign themselves"-that they place themselves on the plain of the opposite principle and also want power by *compelling* the powerful to become their hangmen. This is the European form of Buddhism-*doing* No after all existence has lost its "meaning."

*

It is not that "distress" has grown: on the contrary. "God, morality, resignation," were remedies on terribly low rungs of misery: active nihilism appears in relatively much more favorable conditions. The feeling that morality has been overcome presupposes a fair degree of spiritual culture, and this in turn that one is relatively well off. A certain spiritual weariness that, owing to the long fight of philosophical opinions, has reached the most hopeless skepticism regarding all philosophy, is another sign of the by no means low position of these nihilists. Consider the situation in which the Buddha appeared. The doctrine of the eternal recurrence would have scholarly presuppositions (as did the Buddha's doctrine; e.g., the concept of causality, etc.).

*

What does "underprivileged" mean? Above all, physiologically-no longer politically. The unhealthiest kind of man in Europe (in all classes) furnishes the soil for this nihilism: they will experience the belief in the eternal recurrence as a curse, struck by which one no longer shrinks from any action; not to be extinguished passively but to extinguish everything that is so aim- and meaningless, although this is a mere convulsion, a blind rage at the insight that everything has been for eternities-even this moment of nihilism and lust for destruction.-It is the value of such a crisis that it purlfies, that it pushes together related elements to perish of each other, that it assigns common tasks to men who have opposite ways of thinking-and it also brings to light the weaker and less secure among them and thus promotes an order of rank according to strength, from the point of view of health: those who command are recognized as those who command, those who obey as those who obey. Of course, outside every existing social order.

*

Who will prove to be the strongest in the course of this? The most moderate; those who do not require any extreme articles of faith; those who not only concede but love a fair amount of accidents and nonsense; those who can think of man with a considerable reduction of his value without becoming small and weak on that account: those richest in health who are equal to most misfortunes and therefore not so afraid of misfortunes-human beings who are sure of their power and represent the attained strength of humanity with conscious pride.

*

How would such a human being even think of the eternal recurrence?

56 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)
Periods of European Nihilism

The period of unclarity, of all kinds of tentative men who would conserve the old without letting go of the new.

The period of clarity: one understands that the old and the new are basically opposite, the old values born of declining and the new ones of ascending life-that all the old ideals are hostile to life (born of decadence and agents of decadence, even if in the magnificent Sunday clothes of morality). We understand the old and are far from strong enough for something new.
The period of the three great affects: contempt, pity, destruction.
The period of catastrophe: the advent of a doctrine that sifts men-driving the weak to decisions, and the strong as well-

II. History of European Nihilism

57 (1884)

My friends, it was hard for us when we were young: we suffered youth itself like a serious sickness. That is due to the time into which we have been thrown-a time of extensive inner decay and disintegration, a time that with all its weaknesses, and even with its best strength, opposes the spirit of youth. Disintegration characterizes this time, and thus uncertainty: nothing stands firmly on its feet or on a hard faith in itself; one lives for tomorrow, as the day after tomorrow is dubious. Everything on our way is slippery and dangerous, and the ice that still supports us has become thin: all of us feel the warm, uncanny breath of the thawing wind; where we still walk, soon no one will be able to walk.

58 (1885-1888)

If this is not an age of decay and declining vitality, it is at least one of headlong and arbitrary *experimentation:*-and it is probable that a superabundance of bungled experiments should create an overall impression as of decay-and perhaps even decay itself.

59 (1885-1886)

Toward a History of the Modern Eclipse

[*Verdüsterung.*]

The state nomads (civil servants, etc.): without home.
The decline of the family.
The "good man" as a symptom of exhaustion.
Justice as will to power (breeding).
Lasciviousness and neurosis.
Black music: whither refreshing music?
The anarchist. Contempt for man, nausea.
Deepest difference: whether hunger or overabundance becomes creative? The former generates the ideals of romanticism.
Nordic unnaturalness.
The need for alcoholica: the "distress" of the workers.
Philosophical nihilism.

60 (1885)

The slow emergence and rise of the middle and lower classes (including the lower kind of spirit and body), of which one finds many preludes before the French Revolution-and it would have taken place without the Revolution, too-on the whole, then, the predominance of the herd over all shepherds and bellwethers-involves

1. eclipse of the spirit (the fusion of a Stoic and a frivolous appearance of happiness, characteristic of noble cultures, decreases; one lets much suffering be seen and heard that one formerly bore and hid);
2. *moral* hypocrisy (a way of wishing to distinguish oneself not by means of morality, but by means of the herd virtues: pity, consideration, moderation, which are not recognized and honored outside the herd ability);
3. a *really* great amount of shared suffering (pity) and joy (the pleasure in large-scale associations found in all herd animals-"community spirit," "Fatherland," everything in which the individual does not count).

61 (Summer-Fall 1883)

Our time, with its aspiration to remedy and prevent accidental distresses and to wage preventive war against disagreeable possibilities, is a time of the *poor.* Our "rich"-are poorest of all. The true purpose of all riches is forgotten.

62 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Critique of modern man (his moralistic mendaciousness) :-the "good man" corrupted and seduced by bad institutions (tyrants and priests);-reason as authority;-history as overcoming of errors;-the future as progress;-the Christian state ("the Lord of hosts");-the Christian sex impulse (or marriage);-the kingdom of "justice" (the cult of "humanity");-"freedom."

The romantic pose of modern man:-the noble man (Byron, Victor Hugo, George Sand);-noble indignation;-consecration through passion (as true "nature");-siding with the oppressed and underprivileged: motto of the historians and novelists;-the Stoics of duty;-selflessness as art and knowledge;-altruism as the most mendacious form of egoism (utilitarianism), most sentimental egoism.
All this is eighteenth century. What, on the other hand, has not been inherited from it: insouciance, cheerfulness, elegance, brightness of the spirit. The tempo of the spirit has changed; the enjoyment of refinement and clarity of the spirit has given place to the enjoyment of color, harmony, mass, reality, etc. Sensualism in matters of the spirit. In short, it is the eighteenth century of *Rousseau.*

63 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

On the whole, a tremendous quantum of *humaneness* has been attained in present-day mankind. That this is not felt generally is itself a proof: we have become so sensitive concerning small states of distress that we unjustly ignore what has been attained.
Here one must make allowance for the existence of much decadence, and seen with such eyes our world has to look wretched and miserable. But such eyes have at all times seen the same things:
1. a certain overirritation even of the moral feelings;
2. the quantum of embitterment and eclipse that pessimism carries into judgments: these two together account for the predominance of the opposite notion, that our morality is in a bad way.
The fact of credit, of worldwide trade, of the means of transportation-here a tremendous mild trust in man finds expression.-Another contributing factor is
3. the emancipation of science from moral and religious purposes: a very good sign that, however, is usually misunderstood.
In my own way I attempt a justification of history.

64 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The second Buddhism. The nihilistic catastrophe that finishes Indian culture.-Early signs of it: The immense increase of pity. Spiritual weariness. The reduction of problems to questions of pleasure and displeasure. The war glory that provokes a counterstroke. Just as national demarcation provokes a countermovement, the most cordial "fraternity." The impossibility for religion to go on working with dogmas and fables.

65 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

What is attacked deep down today is the instinct and the will of tradition: all institutions that owe their origins to this instinct violate the taste of the modern spirit.-At bottom, nothing is thought and done without the purpose of eradicating this sense Eor tradition. One considers tradition a fatality; one studies it, recognizes it (as "heredity"), but one does not *want* it. The tensing of a will over long temporal distances, the selection of the states and valuations that allow one to dispose of future centuries-precisely this is antimodern in the highest degree. Which goes to show that it is the disorganizing principles that give our age its character.

66 (Spring-Fall 1887)

"Be simple!"-for us complicated and elusive triers of the reins a demand that is a simple stupidity.-Be natural! But how if one happens to be "unnatural"?

67 (1884)

The former means for obtaining homogeneous, enduring characters for long generations: unalienable landed property, honoring the old (origin of the belief in gods and heroes as ancestors).
Now the breaking up of landed property belongs to the opposite tendency: newspapers (in place of daily prayers), railway, telegraph. Centralization of a tremendous number of different interests in a single soul, which for that reason must be very strong and protean.

68 (March-June 1888)

Why everything turns into *histrionics.*-Modern man lacks: the sure instinct (consequence of a long homogeneous form of activity of one kind of man); the inability to achieve anything perfect is merely a consequence of this: as an individual one can never make up for lost schooling.
That which creates a morality, a code of laws: the profound instinct that only automatism makes possible perfection in life and creation.
But now we have reached the opposite point; indeed, we wanted to reach it: the most extreme consciousness, man's ability to see through himself and history. With this we are practically as far as possible from perfection in being, doing, and willing: our desire, even our will for knowledge is a symptom of a tremendous decadence. We strive for the opposite of that which strong races, strong natures want-understanding is an ending.-
That science is possible in this sense that is cultivated today is proof that all elementary instincts, life's instincts of self-defense and protection, no longer function. We no longer collect, we squander the capital of our ancestors, even in the way in which we seek knowledge.-

69 (1885-1886)****

Nihilistic Trait

a. In the natural sciences ("meaninglessness"); causalism, mechanism. "Lawfulness" an *entr'acte,* a residue.
b. Ditto in politics: one lacks the faith in one's right, innocence; mendaciousness rules and serving the moment.
c. Ditto in economics: the abolition of slavery. The lack of a redeeming class, one that justifies-advent of anarchism. "Education"?
d. Ditto in history: fatalism, Darwinism; the final attempts to read reason and divinity into it fail. Sentimentality in face of the past; one could not endure a biography!-(Here, too, phenomenalism: character as a mask; there are no facts.)
e. Ditto in art: romanticism and its counterstroke (aversion against romantic ideals and lies). The latter, moral as a sense of greater truthfulness, but pessimistic. Pure "artists" (indifferent toward content). (Father-confessor psychology and puritan psychology, two forms of psychological romanticism: but even its counterproposal, the attempt to adopt a purely artistic attitude toward man-even there the opposite valuation is not yet ventured!)

****In the so-called Grossoktav edition published in 1911, p. 499, a through e were taken by the editor from one of Nietzsche's plans for a book, and there they comprised items 5 through 9. The whole plan is printed in 1911, p. 416 *ff,* and it seems appropriate to translate it here in full-mainly on account of its intrinsic interest, but also to show how the editor of the standard edition obtained some of his "aphorisms":

The Will to Power

Attempt at a Revaluation of All Values.

(In four books)

FIRST BOOK: *The danger of dangers* (presentation of nihilism as the *necessary consequence* of our valuations so far). Tremendous forces have been unleashed; but they conflict with each other; they *annihilate* each other. In a democratic commonwealth, where everybody is a specialist. the what-for? and for-whom? are lacking. The class [*Stand*] in which the thousandfold atrophy of all individuals (into mere functions) acquires *meaning.*

SECOND BOOK: *Critique of values* (logic, etc.). Everywhere the disharmony between the ideal and its individual conditions (e.g., honesty among Christians who are continually forced to lie).

THIRD BOOK: *The problem of the legislator* (including the history of solitude). The forces that have been unleashed must be harnessed again lest they annihilate each other; eyes have to be opened for the actual *increase* of strength.

FOURTH BOOK: *The hammer.* What would men have to be like whose valuations are the opposite? Men who have *all* the traits of the modern soul but are strong enough to transform them into so much health-their means for their task.

SILS MARIA. *Summer 1886.*

Plan of the first book

What is dawning is the opposition of the world we revere and the world we live and are. So we can abolish either our reverence or ourselves. The latter constitutes nihilism.

1. The advent of nihilism, theoretical and practical. Its faulty derivation (pessimism, its kinds: preludes of nihilism, although not necessary).
2. Christianity perishing of its morality. "God is truth"; "God is love"; "the just God."-The greatest event-"God is dead"-perceived dimly.
3. Morality, now without any sanction, no longer knows how to maintain itself. Eventually one *drops* the moral interpretation (echoes of the Christian value judgments still fill men's feelings).
4. But it was upon moral judgments that *value* was based so far; above all, the value of philosophy ("of the will to truth"). (The popular ideals-"the sage," "the prophet," "the saint"-have collapsed.)
5. *Nihilistic* trait in the natural sciences....

[(5) through (9) appear above as (a) through (e).]

10. The whole European system of human aspirations has the feeling it is partly meaningless, partly even now "immoral." Probability of a new Buddhism. The greatest danger.-"How are truthfulness, love, and justice related to the *actual* world?" Not at all!-

For the second book

Origin and critique of moral valuations. These two things don't coincide, as is often supposed (this belief itself is the result of a moral judgment to the effect that "something that has come to be in such and such a

way is worth little because its origin is immoral"). Standard for determining the value of moral valuations: critique of the words, "Improvement, perfecting, enhancement."
The basic fact that has been overlooked: the contradiction between "becoming more moral" and the enhancement and strengthening of the type of man.
Homo Natura. The "will to power."

For the third book

The will to power.
How those men would have to be constituted who would accomplish this revaluation in themselves. The order of rank as an order of power: war and danger as presuppositions that a rank maintains its conditions. The grandiose model: man in nature-the weakest, cleverest being making itself master and subjugating the more stupid elements.

For the fourth book

The *greatest* struggle: for that a new *weapon* is needed. The hammer: to conjure up a terrible decision, to confront Europe with the final choice whether its will "wills" its own destruction [*Untergang*]. Prevention of the decline into mediocrity [*Vermittelmässigung*]. Rather even destruction [*Lieber noch Untergang*]!

70 (1885-1886)

Against the doctrine of the influence of the milieu and external causes: the force within is infinitely superior; much that looks like external influence is merely its adaptation from within. The very same milieus can be interpreted and exploited in opposite ways: there are no facts.-A genius is not explained in terms of such conditions of his origin.

71 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

"Modernity" in the perspective of the metaphor of nourishment and digestion.-
Sensibility immensely more irritable (-dressed up moralistically: the increase in *pity*-); the abundance of disparate impressions greater than ever: cosmopolitanism in foods, literatures, newspapers, forms, tastes, even landscapes. The tempo of this influx *prestissimo;* the impressions erase each other; one instinctively resists taking in anything, taking anything deeply, to "digest" anything; a weakening of the power to digest results from this. A kind of adaptation to this flood of impressions takes place: men unlearn spontaneous action, they merely react to stimuli from outside. They spend their strength partly in assimilating things, partly in defense, partly in opposition. *Profound weakening of spontaneity:* the historian, critic, analyst, the interpreter, the observer, the collector, the reader-all of them *reactive* talents-all science!
Artificial change of one's nature into a "mirror"; interested but, as it were, merely epidermically interested; a coolness on principle, a balance, a fixed low temperature closely underneath the thin surface on which warmth, movement, "tempest," and the play of waves are encountered.
Opposition of external mobility and a certain deep heaviness and weariness.

72 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Where does our modern world belong-to exhaustion or ascent?-Its manifoldness and unrest conditioned by the attainment of the highest level of consciousness.

73 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Overwork, curiosity and sympathy-our *modern vices.*

74 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Toward a characterization of "*modernity.*"-Overabundant development of intermediary forms; atrophy of types; traditions break off, schools; the overlordship of the instincts (prepared philosophically: the unconscious *worth more*) after the will power, the willing of end *and* means, has been weakened.

75 (1885)

An able craftsman or scholar cuts a fine figure when he takes pride in his art and looks on life content and satisfied. But nothing looks more wretched than when a shoemaker or schoolmaster gives us to understand with a suffering mien that he was really born for something better. There is nothing better than what is good-and good is having some ability and using that to create, *Tüchtigkeit* or *virtù* in the Italian Renaissance sense.
Today, in our time when the state has an absurdly fat stomach, there are in all fields and departments, in addition to the real workers, also "representatives"; e.g., besides the scholars also scribblers, besides the suffering classes also garrulous, boastful peter-do-wells who "represent" this suffering, not to speak of the professional politicians who are well off while "representing" distress with powerful lungs before a parliament. Our modern life is extremely expensive owing to the large number of intermediaries; in an ancient city, on the other hand, and, echoing that, also in many cities in Spain and Italy, one appeared oneself and would have given a hoot to such modern representatives and intermediaries-or a kick!

76 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The predominance of dealers and intermediaries in spiritual matters, too: the scribbler, the "representative," the historian (who fuses past and present), the exotician and cosmopolitan, the intermediaries between science and philosophy, the semitheologians.

77(1883-1888)

Nothing to date has nauseated me more than the parasites of the spirit: in our unhealthy Europe one already finds them everywhere-and they have the best conscience in the world. Perhaps a little dim, a little *air pessimiste,* but in the main voraclous, dirty, dirtying, creeping in, nestling, thievish, scurvy-and as innocent as all little sinners and microbes. They live off the fact that other people have spirit and squander it: they know that it is of the very essence of the rich spirit to squander itself carelessly, without petty caution, from day to day.-For the spirit is a bad householder and pays no heed to how everybody lives and feeds on it.

78(1885-1886)

Histrionics

The colorfulness of modern man and its charm. Essentially concealment and satiety.
The scribbler.
The politician (in "the nationalist swindle").
Histrionics in the arts:
lack of probity in prior training and schooling (Fromentin); [Eugène Fromentin (1820-1876), French painter.]
the romantics (lack of philosophy and science and superabundance of literature);
the novelists (Walter Scott, but also the Nibelungen monsters along with the most nervous music);
the lyric poets.
Being "scientific."
Virtuosos (Jews).
Popular ideals overcome, but not yet in the eyes of the people: the saint, the sage, the prophet.

79 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The modern spirit's lack of discipline, dressed up in all sorts of moral fashions.-The showy words are: tolerance (for "the incapacity for Yes and No"); *la largeur de sympathie* [The breadth of sympathy.] (= one-third indifference, one-third curiosity, one-third pathological irritability); "objectivity" (lack of personality, lack of will, incapacity for "love"); "freedom" versus rules (romanticism); "truth" versus forgery and lies (naturalism); being "scientific" (the "*document humain*": in other words, the novel of colportage and addition in place of composition); "passion" meaning disorder and immoderation; "depth" meaning confusion, the profuse chaos of symbols.

80 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Toward a critique of the big words.-I am full of suspicion and malice against what they call "ideals": this is *my* pessimism, to have recognized how the "higher feelings" are a source of misfortune and man's loss of value. One is deceived every time one expects "progress" from an ideal; every time so far the victory of the ideal has meant a retrograde movement.
Christianity, the revolution, the abolition of slavery, equal rights, philanthropy, love of peace, justice, truth: all these big words have value only in a fight, as flags: *not* as realities but as *showy words* for something quite different (indeed, opposite!).

81 (1883-1888)

One knows the kind of human being who has fallen in love with the motto, *tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner.* [To understand all is to forgive all.] It is the weak, it is above all the disappointed: if there is something to be forgiven in all, perhaps there is also something to be despised in all. It is the philosophy of disappointment that wraps itself so humanely in pity and looks sweet.
These are romantics whose faith flew the coop: now they at least want to watch how everything passes and goes. They call it *l'art pour l'art,* "objectivity," etc.

82 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Chief symptoms of pessimism: the *dîners chez* Maguy; Russian pessimism (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky); aesthetic pessimism, *l'art pour l'art,* "description" (romantic and antiromantic pessimism); epistemological pessimism (Schopenhauer, phenomenalism); anarchistic pessimism; the "religion of pity," Buddhistic premovement; cultural pessimism (exoticism, cosmopolitanism); moralistic pessimism: I myself.

83 (Spring-Fall 1887)

"Without the Christian faith," Pascal thought, "you, no less than nature and history, will become for yourselves *un monstre et un chaos."* This prophecy we have fulfilled, after the feeble-optimistic eighteenth century had prettified and rationalized man.
Schopenhauer and Pascal.-In an important sense, Schopenhauer is the first to take up again the movement of Pascal: *un monstre et un chaos,* consequently something to be negated.-History, nature, man himself.

"Our inability to know the truth is the consequence of our corruption, our moral decay"; thus Pascal. And thus, at bottom, Schopenhauer. "The deeper the corruption of reason, the more necessary the doctrine of salvation"-or, in Schopenhauer's terms, negation.

84 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Schopenhauer as throwback (state before the revolution): Pity, sensuality, art, weakness of the will, catholicism of spiritual cravings-that is good eighteenth century *au fond.* [At bottom.]

Schopenhauer's basic misunderstanding of the will (as if craving, instinct, drive were the *essence* of will) is typical: lowering the value of the will to the point of making a real mistake. Also hatred against willing; attempt to see something higher, indeed that which is higher and valuable, in willing no more, in "being a subject *without* aim and purpose" (in the "pure subject free of will"). Great symptom of the *exhaustion* or the *weakness* of the *will:* for the will is precisely that which treats cravings as their master and appoints to them their way and measure.

85 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The unworthy attempt has been made to see Wagner and Schopenhauer as types of mental illness: one would gain an incomparably more essential insight by making more precise scientifically the type of decadence both represent.

86 (1888)

Your Henrilc Ibsen has become very clear to me. For all his robust idealism and "will to truth" he did not dare to liberate himself from the illusionism of morality that speaks of freedom without wishing to admit to itself what freedom is: the second stage in the metamorphosis of the "will to power"-for those who lack freedom. On the first stage one demands justice from those who are in power. On the second, one speaks of "freedom-that is, one wants to get away from those in power. On the third, one speaks of *"equal rights"*-that is, as long as one has not yet gained superiority one wants to prevent one's competitors from growing in power.

87 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Decline of *Protestantism:* understood as a halfway house both theoretically and historically. Actual superiority of Catholicism; the feeling of Protestantism extinguished to such an extent that the strongest *anti-Protestant* movements are no longer experienced as such (for example, Wagner's *Parsifal*). All of the higher regions of the spirit in France are *Catholic* in their instincts; Bismarck realizes that Protestantism simply doesn't exist any more.

88 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Protestantism, that spiritually unclean and boring form of decadence in which Christianity has been able so far to preserve itself in the mediocre north: valuable for knowledge as something complex and a halfway house, in so far as it brought together in the same heads experiences of different orders and origins.

89 (March-June 1888)

How did the German spirit transform Christianity!-And to stick to Protestantism: how much beer there is in Protestant Christianity! Can one even imagine a spiritually staler, lazier, more comfortably relaxed form of the Christian faith than that of the average Protestant in Germany?

That's what I call a modest version of Christianity! A homoeopathy of Christianity is what I call it.

One reminds me that today we also encounter an *immodest* Protestantism-that of the court chaplains and anti-Semitic speculators: but nobody has claimed yet that any "spirit" whatever "moved" on the faces of these waters.-That is merely a more indecent form of Christianity, by no means more sensible.

90 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Progress.-Let us not be deceived! Time marches forward; we'd like to believe that everything that is in it also marches forward-that the development is one that moves forward.

The most level-headed are led astray by this illusion. But the nineteenth century does not represent progress over the sixteenth; and the German spirit of 1888 represents a regress from the German spirit of 1788.

"Mankind" does not advance, it does not even exist. The overall aspect is that of a tremendous experimental laboratory in which a few successes are scored, scattered throughout all ages, while there are untold failures, and all order, logic, union, and obligingness are lacking. How can we fail to recognize that the ascent of Christianity is a movement of decadence?-That the German Reformation is a recrudescence of Christian barbarism?-That the Revolution destroyed the instinct for a grand organization of society?

Man represents no progress over the animal: the civilized tenderfoot is an abortion compared to the Arab and Corsican; the Chinese is a more successful type, namely more durable, than the European.

91 (1885)

On German Pessimism

The eclipse, the pessimistic coloring, comes necessarily in the wake of the Enlightenment. Around 1770 the decline of cheerfulness began to be noticed; women, with that feminine instinct which always sides with virtue, supposed that immorality was the cause. Galiani hit the nail on the head: he cites Voltaire's verse:

Un monstre gai vaut mieux
Qu'un sentimental ennuyeux.

When I believe now that I am a few centuries ahead in Enlightenment not only of Voltaire but even of Galiani, who was far profounder-how far must I have got in the increase of darkness! And this is really the case, and I bewared in time, with some sort of regret, of the German and Christian narrowness and inconsequence of pessimism à la Schopenhauer or, worse, Leopardi, and sought out the most quintessential forms (Asia). But in order to endure this type of extreme pessimism (it can be perceived here and there in my *Birth of Tragedy*) and to live alone "without God and morality" I had to invent a counterpart for myself. Perhaps I know best why man alone laughs: he alone suffers so deeply that he *had* to invent laughter. The unhappiest and most melancholy animal is, as fitting, the most cheerful.

92 (1883-1888)

Regarding German culture, I have always had the feeling of *decline.* This fact, that I first became acquainted with a type in decline, has often made me unfair to the *whole* phenomenon oi European culture. The Germans always come after the others, much later: they are carrying something in the depths; e.g.,-
Dependence on other countries; e.g., *Kant*-Rousseau, Sensualists, Hume, Swedenborg.
Schopenhauer-Indians and romanticism, Voltaire.
Wagner-French cult of the gruesome and of grand opera,
Paris and the flight into primeval states (marriage with the sister).
-The law of the latecomers (province to Paris, Germany to
France). Why the Germans of all people discovered the Greek
spirit (the more one develops a drive, the more attractive does it
become to plunge for once into its opposite).
Music is swan song. [*"Musik ist Ausklingen."*]

93 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Renaissance and Reformation.-What does the Renaissance prove? That the reign of the individual has to be brief. The squandering is too great; the very possibility of collecting and capitalizing is lacking; and exhaustion follows immediately. These are times when everything is *spent,* when the very strength is spent with which one collects, capitalizes, and piles riches upon riches.-Even the opponents of such movements are forced into an absurd waste of energy; they, too, soon become exhausted, spent, desolate.
In the Reformation we possess a wild and vulgar counterpart to the Italian Renaissance, born of related impulses; only in the retarded north, which had remained coarse, they had to don a religious disguise; for there the concept of the higher life had not yet detached itself from that of the religious life.
Through the Reformation, too, the individual sought freedom; "everybody his own priest" is also a mere formula of libertinage. In truth, one word was enough-"evangelical freedom"-and all instincts that had reason to remain hidden broke out like wild dogs, the most brutal requirements suddenly acquired the courage to face themselves, and everything seemed justified.-One was careful not to understand what liberty one had really meant at bottom; one shut one's eyes before oneself.-But shutting one's eyes and moistening one's lips with enthusiastic orations did not prevent one's hands from grasping whatever could be grabbed, and the belly became the god of the "free evangel," and all the cravings of revenge and envy satisfied themselves with insatiable rage.-
This took a while; then exhaustion set in, just as it had in the south of Europe-and here, too, a *vulgar* kind of exhaustion, a general *ruere in servitium.* ["Plunging into servitude."]-The *indecent* century of Germany arrived.-

94 (1884)

Chivalry as the conquered position of power: its gradual breaking up (and in part transition into what is more spread out, bourgeois). In La Rochefoucauld we find a consciousness of the true motive springs of noblesse of the mind-and a view of these motive springs that is darkened by Christianity.
The French Revolution as the continuation of Christianity. Rousseau is the seducer: he again unfetters woman who is henceforth represented in an ever more interesting manner-as suffering. Then the slaves and Mrs. Beecher-Stowe. Then the poor and the workers. Then the vice addicts and the sick-all this is moved into the foreground (even to develop sympathy for the genius one no longer knows any other way for the past five hundred years than to represent him as the bearer of great suffering!). Next come the curse on voluptuousness (Baudelaire and Schopenhauer); the most decided conviction that the lust to rule is the greatest vice; the perfect certainty that morality and disinterestedness are identical concepts and that the "happiness of all" is a goal worth striving for (i.e., the kingdom of heaven of Christ). We are well along on the

way: the kingdom of heaven of the poor in spirit has begun.-Intermediary stages: the bourgeois (a parvenu on account of money) and the worker (on account of the machine).
Comparison of Greek culture and that of the French in the age of Louis XIV. Decided faith in oneself. A leisure class whose members make things difficult for themselves and exercise much self-overcoming. The power of form, the will to give form to oneself. "Happiness" admitted as a goal. Much strength and energy behind the emphasis on forms. The delight in looking at a life that seems so easy.-To the French, the Greeks looked like children.

95 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The Three Centuries

Their different sensibilities are best expressed thus:
Aristocratism: Descartes, rule of reason, testimony of the sovereignty of the will;
Feminism: Rousseau, rule of feeling, testimony of the sovereignty of the senses, mendacious;
Animalism: Schopenhauer, rule of craving, testimony of the sovereignty of animality, more honest but gloomy.
The seventeenth century is aristocratic, imposes order, looks down haughtily upon the animalic, is severe against the heart, not cozy, without sentiment, "un-German," averse to what is burlesque and what is natural, inclined to generalizations and sovereign confronted with the past-for it believes in itself. Much beast of prey *au fond,* much ascetic habit to remain master. The century of strong will; also of strong passion.
The eighteenth century is dominated by woman, given to enthusiasm, full of *esprit,* shallow, but with a spirit in the service of what is desirable, of the heart, libertine in the enjoyment of what is most spiritual, and undermines all authorities; intoxicated, cheerful, clear, humane, false before itself, much canaille *au fond,* sociable.-
The nineteenth century is more animalic and subterranean, uglier, more realistic and vulgar, and precisely for that reason "better," "more honest," more submissive before every kind of "reality," truer; but weak in will, but sad and full of dark cravings, but fatalistic. Not full of awe and reverence for either "reason" or "heart"; deeply convinced of the rule of cravings (Schopenhauer spoke of "will"; but nothing is more characteristic of his philosophy than the absence of all genuine willing). Even morality reduced to one instinct ("pity").
Auguste Comte is a continuation of the eighteenth century (domination of *coeur* over *la tête,* sensualism in the theory of knowledge, altruistic enthusiasm).
That science has become sovereign to such a degree proves how the nineteenth century has rid itself of the domination of ideals. A certain frugality of desire makes possible our scientific curiosity and severity-which is *our* kind of virtue.-
Romanticism is an echo of the eighteenth century; a kind of piled-high desire for its enthusiasm in the grand style (as a matter of fact, a good deal of histrionics and self-deception: one wanted to represent strong natures and grand passions).
The nineteenth century looks instinctively for theories that seem to justify its fatalistic submission to matters of fact. Already *Hegel's* success against "sentimentality" and romantic idealism was due to his fatalistic way of thinking, to his faith in the greater reason on the side of the victorious, to his justification of the actual "state" (in place of "mankind," etc.).-
Schopenhauer: we are something stupid and, at best, even something that cancels itself. Success of determinism, of the genealogical derivation of obligations that had formerly been considered absolute, the doctrine of milieu and adaptation, the reduction of will to reflexes, the denial of the will as an "efficient cause"; finally-a real rechristening: one sees so little will that the word becomes free to designate something else. Further theories: the doctrine of objectivity-"will-less" contemplation-as the only road to truth; also to beauty (-also the faith in the "genius" to justify a right to submission); mechanism, the calculable rigidity of the mechanical process; the alleged "naturalism," elimination of the choosing, judging, interpreting subject as a principle-
Kant, with his "practical reason" and his moral fanaticism is wholly eighteenth century; still entirely outside the historical movement; without any eye for the actuality of his time, e.g., Revolution; untouched by Greek philosophy; fanciful visionary of the concept of duty; sensualist with the backdrop of the pampering of dogmatism.-
The movement back to Kant in our century is a movement back to the eighteenth century: one wants to regain a right to the old ideals and the old enthusiasm-for that reason an epistemology that "sets boundaries," which means that it permits one to posit as one may see fit a beyond of reason.-
Hegel's way of thinking is not far different from *Goethe's:* one needs only to listen to Goethe about *Spinoza.* Will to deify the universe and life in order to find *repose* and *happiness* in contemplation and in getting to the bottom of things; Hegel seeks reason everywhere-before reason one may submit and acquiesce. In Goethe

a kind of almost *joyous* and *trusting fatalism* that does not revolt, that does not flag, that seeks to form a totality out of himself, in the faith that only in the totality everything redeems itself and appears good and justified.

96 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Period of the *Enlightenment*-followed by the period of *sentimentality.* To what extent Schopenhauer belongs to "sentimentality" (Hegel to spirituality).

97 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The seventeenth century suffers of man as of a sum of contradictions (*"l'amas de contradictions"* that we are); it seeks to discover, order, excavate man-while the eighteenth century seeks to forget what is known of man's nature in order to assimilate him to its utopia. "Superficial, tender, humane"-enthusiastic about "man"-
The seventeenth century seeks to erase the tracks of the individual to make the work look as similar to life as possible. The eighteenth uses the work in an attempt to arouse interest in the author. The seventeenth century seeks in art-art, a piece of culture; the eighteenth uses art to make propaganda for reforms of a social and political nature.
"Utopia," the "ideal man," the deification of nature, the vanity of posing, the subordination to propaganda for social goals, charlatanism-these are our gifts from the eighteenth century.
The style of the seventeenth century: *propre, exact et libre.*
The strong individual, self-sufficient or zealously occupied before God-and this modern obtrusiveness of authors who all but leap out at you-these furnish some contrast. "To perform"-compare that with the scholars of Port-Royal.
Alfieri [Count Vittorio Alfieri (1749-1803), Italian dramatist.] had a sense for grand style.
Hatred of the burlesque (undignified), lack of a sense for nature belong to the seventeenth century.

98 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Against Rousseau.- Unfortunately, man is no longer evil enough; Rousseau's opponents who say "man is a beast of prey" are unfortunately wrong. Not the corruption of man but the extent to which he has become tender and moralized is his curse.
Precisely in the sphere that Rousseau fought most violently one could find the *relatively* still strong and well-turned-out type of man (those in whom the grand affects were still unbroken: will to power, will to enjoyment, will and capacity to command). The man of the eighteenth century has to be compared with the man of the Renaissance (also with the man of the seventeenth century in France), so that one feels what is at stake: Rousseau is a symptom of self self-contempt and heated vanity-both signs that the domineering will is lacking: he moralizes and, as a man of rancor, seeks the cause of his wretchedness in the ruling classes.

99 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Against Rousseau.-The state of nature is terrible, man is a beast of prey; our civilization represents a tremendous triumph over this beast-of-prey nature: thus argued Voltaire. He felt the mitigation, the subtleties, the spiritual joys of the civilized state; he despised narrowmindedness, also in the form of virtue, and the lack of delicatesse, also among ascetics and monks.
The moral reprehensibility of man seemed to preoccupy Rousseau; with the words "unjust" and "cruel" one can best stir up the instincts of the oppressed who otherwise smart under the ban of the *vetitum* and disfavor, so their conscience advises them against rebellious cravings. Such emancipators seek one thing above all: to give their party the grand accents and poses of the higher nature.

100 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Rousseau: the rule based on feeling; nature as the source of justice; man perfects himself to the extent to which he approaches nature (according to Voltaire, to the extent to which he moves away from nature). The very same epochs are for one ages of the progress of humanity; for the other, times when injustice and inequality grow worse.
Voltaire still comprehended *umanità* in the Renaissance sense; also *virtù* (as "high culture"); he tights for the cause of the *"honnêtes gens"* and *"de la bonne compagnie,"*[Humanity, virtue, honorable people, good society.] the cause of taste, of science, of the arts, of progress itself and civilization.
The fight began around 1760: the citizen of Geneva and *le seigneur de Ferney.* [The squire of Ferney.] Only from that moment on Voltaire becomes the man of his century, the philosopher, the representative of tolerance and unbelief (till then merely *un bel esprit*). Envy and hatred of Rousseau's success impelled him forward, "to the heights."
Pour "la canaille" un dieu remunerateur et vengeur-Voltaire. [For the rabble, a rewarding and avenging god.]
Critique of both points of view in regard to the *value of civilization.* The social invention is for Voltaire the most beautiful there is: there is no higher goal than to maintain and perfect it; precisely this is *honnêteté,* [Decency.] to respect social conventions; virtue as obedience to certain necessary "prejudices" in favor of the

preservation of "society." *Missionary of culture,* aristocrat, representative of the victorious, ruling classes and their valuations. But Rousseau remained a *plebeian,* also as *homme de lettres;* [Man of letters.] that was *unheard of;* his impudent contempt of all that was not he himself.
What was *sick* in Rousseau was admired and *imitated* most. (Lord Byron related to him; also worked himself up into sublime poses and into vindictive rancor; sign of "meanness"; later attained balance through Venice and comprehended what produces more ease and well-being-*l'insouciance.*) [Nonchalance.]
Rousseau is proud in regard to what he is, in spite of his origins; but he is beside himself when one reminds him of it.-
Rousseau, beyond a doubt, mentally disturbed; in Voltaire an uncommon health and light touch. *The rancor of the sick;* the periods of his insanity also those of his contempt of man and his mistrust.
The defense of *providence* by Rousseau (against the pessimism of Voltaire): he *needed* God in order to be able to cast a curse upon society and civilization; everything had to be good in itself because God had created it; *only man has corrupted men.* The "good man" as the natural man was pure fantasy; but with the dogma of God's authorship it seemed probable and well-founded.
Romanticism á la Rousseau: passion ("the sovereign right of passion"); "naturalness"; the fascination of madness (folly included in greatness); the absurd vanity of the weak man; the rancor of the mob as judge ("for a hundred years now, a sick man has been accepted as a leader in politics").

101 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Kant: makes the epistemological skepticism of the English possible for Germans:
1. by enlisting for it the sympathy of the moral and religious needs of the Germans; just as the later philosophers of the Academy used skepticism for the same reason, as a preparation for Platonism (*vide* Augustin); and as Pascal used even moralistic skepticism in order to excite the need for faith ("to justify it");
2. by scholastically involuting and curlicueing it and thus making it acceptable for the German taste regarding scientific form (for Locke and Hume in themselves were too bright, too clear, i.e., judged according to German value instincts, "too superficial"-)
Kant: inferior in his psychology and knowledge of human nature; way off when it comes to great historical values (French Revolution); a moral fanatic à la Rousseau; a subterranean Christianity in his values; a dogmatist through and through, but ponderously sick of this inclination, to such an extent that he wished to tyrannize it, but also weary right away of skepticism; not yet touched by the slightest breath of cosmopolitan taste and the beauty of antiquity-a *delayer* and *mediator,* nothing original (just as *Leibniz mediated* and built a *bridge* between mechanism and spiritualism, as *Goethe* did between the taste of the eighteenth century and that of the "historical sense" (which is essentially a sense for the exotic), as *German music* did between French and Italian music, as *Charlemagne* did between *imperium Romanum* and nationalism-*delayers par excellence.*)

102 (Spring-Fall 1887)

In how far the *Christian* centuries with their pessimism were *stronger* centuries than the eighteenth century-like the *tragic* era of the Greeks.
The nineteenth century vis-à-vis the eighteenth century. In what respects heir-in what respects a regression (poorer in "spirit" and taste)-in what respects progress (darker, more realistic, stronger).

103 (1883-1888)

What does it mean that we have such a feeling for the *campagna Romana?* And for high mountain ranges? What is the *meaning* of our nationalism?
Chateaubriand in 1803, in a letter to M. de Fontanes, gives the first impression of the *campagna Romana.*
President de Brosses says of the *campagna Romana: "il fallait que Romulus fût ivre, quand il songea à bâtir une ville dans un terrain aussi laid."* [Romulus must have been drunk when he thought of building a city in such an ugly place.]
Delacroix, too, did not like Rome, it frightened him. He was enthusiastic about Venice, like Shakespeare, like Byron, like George Sand. This aversion to Rome also in Theoph. Gautier-and in Rich. Wagner.
Lamartine has found language for Sorrent and Posilipp.
Victor Hugo was enthusiastic about Spain, *"parce que aucune autre nation n'a moins emprunté à l'antiquité, parce qu'elle n'a subi aucune influence classique."* [Because no other nation borrowed less from antiquity, because she underwent no classical influence.]

104 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The *two great tentative ones,* made to overcome the eighteenth century:
Napoleon, by awakening again the man, the soldier, and the great fight for power-conceiving Europe as a political unit;
Goethe, by imagining a European culture that would harvest the full inheritance of *attained* humanity.

German culture of this century arouses mistrust-in music this full, redeeming and binding element of Goethe is lacking-The Austrians have remained German only by virtue of their music.

105 (1883-1888)

The preponderance of *music* in the romantics of 1839 and 1840. Delacroix. Ingres, a passionate musician (cult of Gluck, Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart), said to his students in Rome, *"si je pouvais vous rendre tous musicians, vous y gagneriez comme peintres"* [If I could make you all musicians you'd become better painters.]; also Horace Vernet, with a special passion for *Don Giovanni* (as Mendelssohn testifies, 1831); also Stendhal, who said of himself: *Combien de lieues ne ferais-je pas à pied, et à combien de jours de prison ne me soumetterais-je pas pour entendre Don Juan ou le Matromonio segreto: et je ne sais pour queue autre chose je ferais cet effort.* [How many leagues would I not walk and how many days in prison would I not endure to hear *Don Giovanni* or *Le Matromonio Segreto;* and I don't know for what else I should make such an effort.] At that time he was 56.

Borrowed forms; e.g., Brahms as typical "epigone"; Mendelssohn's educated Protestantism, ditto (an earlier "soul" is recaptured poetically-)

-moral and poetical substitutions in Wagner, *one* art as stopgap for deficiencies in the others

-the "historical sense," inspiration from poetry and ancient sagas

-that typical transformation of which G. Flaubert offers the clearest example among the French and Richard Wagner among the Germans, in which the romantic faith in love and the future is transformed into the desire for the nothing, 1830 into 1850.

106 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Why does German music culminate in the period of German romanticism? Why is Goethe missing in German music? How much Schiller-more precisely, how much "Thekla" [Woman in the cast of Schiller's *Wallenstein.*]-there is in Beethoven!

Schumann has in himself Eichendorff, Uhland, Heine, Hoffmann, Tieck. Richard Wagner has *Freischütz* [Opera by Lortzing.], Hoffmann, Grimm, the romantic saga, the mystical catholicism of instinct, symbolism, the "libertinism of passion" (Rousseau's intent). *The Flying Dutchman* tastes of France, where *le ténébreux* [The dark (or devilish) man.] was the type of the seducer in 1830.

Cult of music, of the revolutionary romanticism of form. Wagner sums up romanticism, German as well as French-

107 (1888)

Estimated merely for his value for Germany and German culture, Richard Wagner remains a great question mark, perhaps a German misfortune, in any case a destiny: but what does it matter? Isn't he very much more than merely a German event? It even seems to me that there is no place where he belongs less than Germany: nothing was prepared for him there; his whole type remains simply strange among Germans, odd, uncomprehended, incomprehensible But one is careful not to admit this to oneself: for that one is too kindly, too square, too German. *"Credo quia absurdus est"* ["I believe because he is absurd." Variation of the famous, "I believe because it is absurd," usually ascribed to Tertullian.]: that is what the German spirit wants and also wanted in this case-and so it believes for the present whatever Wagner wanted people to believe about him. The German spirit has at all times lacked subtlety and divination *in psychologicis*. Today, under the high pressure of fatherlandism and self-admiration, it is visibly thickening and becoming coarser: how should it be capable of coping with the problem of Wagner!-

108 (1885)

So far, the Germans are nothing, but they will become something; thus they have no culture yet-thus they cannot have any culture yet. That is my proposition: let those who cannot help it take offense.-So far they are nothing: that means, they are all sorts of things. They will become something: that means, they will stop some day being all sorts of things. The latter is at bottom a mere wish, scarcely a hope; fortunately, a wish on which one can live, a matter of will, of work, of discipline, of breeding, as well as a matter of annoyance [*Unwillen,* literally: un-will. A play on words.], of desire, of missing something, of discomfort, even of embitterment-in brief, we Germans desire something from ourselves that has not yet been desired from us-we desire something more!

That this "German as he is not yet" deserves something better than today's German *"Bildung"* [The word means both culture and education-that which is taken to distinguish those who are educated.]; that all who are "in the process of becoming" must be furious when they perceive some satisfaction in this area, an impertinent "retiring on one's laurels" or "self-congratulation": that is my second proposition on which I also have not yet changed my mind.

109 (1885)

Principle: There is an element of decay in everything that characterizes modern man: but close beside this sickness stand signs of an untested force and powerfulness of the soul. *The same reasons that produce the increasing smallness of man drive the stronger and rarer individuals up to greatness.*

110 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Overall insight: the ambiguous character of our *modern* world-the very same symptoms could point to *decline* and to *strength.* And the signs of strength, of the attainment of majority, could be misconstrued as weakness on the basis of traditional (residual) negative emotional valuations. In brief, our feelings, as feelings about values, are not up to date.

To generalize: feelings about values are always behind the times; they express conditions of preservation and growth that belong to times long gone by; they resist new conditions of existence with which they cannot cope and which they necessarily misunderstand: thus they inhibit and arouse suspicion against what is new.-

111 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The problem of the nineteenth century. Whether its strong and weak sides belong together? Whether it is all of one piece? Whether the diverseness of its ideals and their mutual inconsistency are due to a higher aim: *as* something higher.-For it could be the precondition of greatness to grow to such an extent in violent tension. Dissatisfaction, nihilism *could* be a good sign.

112 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Overall insight.-Actually, every major growth is accompanied by a tremendous crumbling and passing away: suffering, the symptoms of decline *belong* in the times of tremendous advances; every fruitful and powerful movement of humanity has also created at the same time a nihilistic movement. It could be the sign of a crucial and most essential growth, of the transition to new conditions of existence, that the most extreme form of pessimism, genuine *nihilism,* would come into the world. *This I have comprehended.*

113 (1883-1888)

(A)

To begin with a full and cordial tribute to contemporary humanity: not to be deceived by appearances-this type of humanity is less striking but gives far better warranties of duration; its tempo is slower, but the beat is much richer. Health is increasing, the actual conditions for a strong body get recognized and are slowly created, "asceticism" *ironice* [Ironically.]. One shrinks from extremes; a certain confidence in the "right road"; no enthusing; temporary acclimatization to narrower values (like "fatherland," like "scholarship," etc.).

Still, this whole picture would remain *ambiguous:* it could be an ascending but also a descending movement of life.

(B)

Faith in *"progress"*-in the lower spheres of intelligence it appears as ascending life; but this is self-deception; in the higher spheres of intelligence as decending life.

Description of the symptoms.

Unity of point of view: uncertainty about standards of value.

Fear of a general "in vain."

Nihilism.

114 (June 10,1887)

Actually, we have no longer such need of an antidote to the *first* nihilism: life in our Europe is no longer that uncertain, capricious, absurd. Such a tremendous increase in the value of man, the value of trouble, etc., is not so needful now; we can take a significant decrease of this value, we may concede much absurdity and caprice: the power man has attained now permits a demotion of the means of breeding of which the moral interpretation was the strongest. "God" is far too extreme a hypothesis.

115 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

If anything sign)fies our *humanization*-a genuine and actual *progress*-it is the fact that we no longer require excessive oppositions, indeed no opposites at all-

we may love the senses, we have spiritualized and made
them artistic in every degree;
we have a right to all those things which were most *maligned* until now."

116 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The inversion of the order of rank.-The pious counterfeiters, the priests, among us become chandalas-they replace the charlatans, quacks, counterfeiters, and wizards; we consider them corrupters of the will, great slanderers of life on which they wish to revenge themselves, *rebels* among the underprivileged. We have turned the caste of servants, the Sudras, into our middle class, our *"Volk"* ["people"], those who make political decisions.

On the other hand, the chandala of former times is at the top: foremost, those who *blaspheme God, the immoralists,* the nomads of every type, the artists, Jews, musicians-at bottom, all disreputable classes of men-

We have raised ourselves to the level of *honorable* thoughts; even more, we *determine* honor on earth, "nobility"-All of us are today *advocates of life.-We immoralists* are today the *strongest power:* the other great powers need us-we construe the world in our image-

We have transferred the concept of the "chandala" to the *priests, teachers of a beyond,* and the *Christian society* that is grown together with them, as well as all who are of the same origin, the pessimists, nihilists, romantics of pity, criminals, vice addicts-the whole sphere in which the concept of "God" is imagined as a *savior-*

We are proud of no longer having to be liars, slanderers, men who cast suspicion on life-

117 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Progress of the nineteenth century against the eighteenth (-at bottom we *good Europeans* wage a war against the eighteenth century-):

1. "Return to nature" understood more and more decisively in the opposite sense from Rousseau's. *Away from idyl and opera!*
2. more and more decisively anti-idealistic, more concrete, more fearless, industrious, moderate, suspicious against sudden changes, *antirevolutionary;*
3. more and more decisively the question concerning the *health of the body* is put ahead of that of "the soul": the latter being understood as a state consequent upon the former, and the former at the very least as a precondition of the health of the soul.

118 (1883-1888)

If anything at all has been achieved, it is a more innocuous relation to the senses, a more joyous, benevolent, Goethean attitude toward sensuality; also a prouder feeling regarding the search for knowledge, so that the "pure fool" [Glorified by Wagner in *Parsifal*.] is not given much credit.

119 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. 1888)

We who are *"objective."*-It is not "pity" that opens the gates to the most distant and strange types of being and culture to *us,* but rather our accessibility and lack of partiality that does *not* empathize with or share suffering but on the contrary takes delight in a hundred things that formerly led people to suffer (feel outraged or deeply moved, or prompted hostile and cold looks-). Suffering in all its nuances has become interesting for us: in this respect we are certainly *not* fuller of pity, even when we are shaken by the sight of suffering and moved to tears: we do not by any means for that reason feel like helping.

In this *voluntary* desire to contemplate all sorts of distress and transgressions we have become stronger and more vigorous than the eighteenth century was; it is a proof of our increase in vigor (we have come closer to the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries-). But it is a profound misunderstanding to construe our "romanticism" as a proof that our "souls" have become "more beautiful"-

We desire *strong* sensations as all *coarser* ages and social strata do.-This should be distinguished from the needs of those with weak nerves and the decadents: they have a need for pepper, even for cruelty-

All of us seek states in which bourgeois morality *no longer has any say,* and priestly morality even less (-every book to which some of the air of pastors and theologians still clings gives us the impression of a pitiable *niaiserie* [Silliness.] and poverty.-"Good society" consists of those whom at bottom nothing interests except what is *forbidden* in bourgeois society and gives a bad reputation: the same applies to books, music, politics, and the estimation of woman.

120 (Spring-Fall 1887)

How man has become more natural in the nineteenth century (the eighteenth century is that of elegance, refinement, and *sentiments genereux*).-*Not* "return to nature"-for there has never yet been a natural humanity. The scholasticism of un- and *anti-* natural values is the rule, is the beginning; man reaches nature only after a long struggle-he never "returns"-Nature: i.e., daring to be immoral like nature.

We are coarser, more direct, full of irony against generous feelings even when we succumb to them.

More natural is our first society, that of the rich, the leisure class: they hunt each other, love between the sexes is a kind of sport in which marriage furnishes an obstacle and a provocation; they amuse themselves and live for pleasure; they esteem physical advantages above all, are curious and bold.

More natural is our attitude to the search for knowledge: we possess libertinage of the spirit in all innocence, we hate pompous and hieratical manners, we delight in what is most forbidden, we should hardly know any longer of any interest of knowledge if the way to it were paved with boredom.

More natural is our attitude toward morality. Principles have become ridiculous; nobody permits himself any longer to speak without irony of his "duty." But a helpful, benevolent disposition is esteemed (morality is found in an *instinct,* and the rest is spurned. In addition a few concepts of points of honor-).
More natural is our position in *politicis:* we see problems of power, of one quantum of power against another. We do not believe in any right that is not supported by the power of enforcement: we feel all rights to be conquests.
More natural is our estimation of great human beings and great things: we consider passion a privilege, we consider nothing great unless it includes a great crime; we conceive all being-great as a placing-oneself-outside as far as morality is concerned.
More natural is our attitude toward nature: we no longer love it on account of its "innocence," "reason," or "beauty"; we have made it nicely "devilish" and "dumb." But instead of despising it on that account, we have felt more closely related to it ever since, more at home in it. It does *not* aspire to virtue, and for that we respect nature.
More natural is our attitude toward art: we do not demand beautiful illusory lies from it, etc.; brutal positivism reigns, recognizing facts without becoming excited.
In summa: there are signs that the European of the nineteenth century is less ashamed of his instincts; he has taken a goodly step toward admitting to himself his unconditional naturalness, i.e., his immorality, *without becoming embittered*-on the contrary, strong enough to endure only this sight.
This sounds to some ears as if corruption had progressed-and it is certain that man has not come close to that *"nature"* of which *Rousseau* speaks but has progressed another step in civilization, which Rousseau *abhorred.* We have become *stronger:* we have again come closer to the seventeenth century, especially to the taste of its end (Dancourt, Lesage, Regnard) [Florent Carton Dancourt (1661-1725), French dramatist; Alain René Lesage (1668-1747), French novelist and dramatist; and Jean François Regnard (1655-1709), French comic dramatist.]

121 (1888)

Culture contra civilization.-The high points of culture and civilization do not coincide: one should not be deceived about the abysmal antagonism of culture and civilization. The great moments of culture were always, morally speaking, times of corruption; and conversely, the periods when the taming of the human animal ("civilization") was desired and enforced were times of intolerance against the boldest and most spiritual natures. Civilization has aims different from those of culture-perhaps they are even opposite-

122 (January-Fall 1888)

What I warn against: the instincts of decadence should not be confused with *hurnaneness;* the means of civilization, which lead
necessarily to decadence, should not be confused with culture; the libertinage, the principle of *"laisser aller,"* should not be confused with the will to power (-which is the counterprinciple).

123 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The unfinished problems I pose anew: the problem of civilization, the fight between Rousseau and Voltaire around 1760. Man becomes more profound, mistrustful, "immoral," stronger, more confident of himself-and to this extent "more natural": this is "progress."-At the same time, in accordance with a kind of division of labor, the strata that have become more evil are separated from those that have become milder and tamer-so that the overall fact is not noticed immediately.-It is characteristic of strength, of the self-control and fascination of strength, that these stronger strata possess the art of making others experience their progress in evil as something higher. It is characteristic of every "progress" that the strengthened elements are reinterpreted as "good."

124 (Spring-Fall 1887)

To give men back the courage to their natural drives-
To check their self-underestimation (not that of man as an individual but that of man as nature-)-
To remove antitheses from things after comprehending that we have projected them there-
To remove the idiosyncrasies of society from existence (guilt, punishment, justice, honesty, freedom, love, etc.)-
Progress toward "naturalness": in all political questions, also in the relations of parties, even of commercial, workers', and employers' parties, questions of power are at stake-"what one *can* do," and only after that what one ought to do.

125 (1885)

Socialism-as the logical conclusion of the *tyranny* of the least and the dumbest, i.e., those who are superficial, envious, and three-quarters actors-is indeed entailed by "modern ideas" and their latent anarchism; but in the tepid air of democratic well-being the capacity to reach conclusions, or to finish,

weakens. One follows-but one no longer sees what follows. Therefore socialism is on the whole a hopeless and sour affair; and nothing offers a more amusing spectacle than the contrast between the poisonous and desperate faces cut by today's socialists-and to what wretched and pinched feelings their *style* bears witness!-and the harmless lambs' happiness of their hopes and desiderata. Nevertheless, in many places in Europe they may yet bring off occasional coups and attacks: there will be deep "rumblings" in the stomach of the next century, and the Paris commune, which has its apologists and advocates in Germany, too, was perhaps no more than a minor indigestion compared to what is coming. But there will always be too many who have possessions for socialism to signify more than an attack of sickness-and those who have possessions are of one mind on one article of faith: "one must possess something in order to *be* something." But this is the oldest and healthiest of all instincts: I should add, "one must want to have more than one has in order to *become* more." For this is the doctrine preached by life itself to all that has life: the morality of development. To have and to want to have more-*growth,* in one word-that is life itself. In the doctrine of socialism there is hidden, rather badly, a "will to negate life"; the human beings or races that think up such a doctrine must be bungled. Indeed, I should wish that a few great experiments might prove that in a socialist society life negates itself, cuts off its own roots. The earth is large enough and man still sufficiently unexhausted; hence such a practical instruction and *demonstratio ad absurdum* would not strike me as undesirable, even if it were gained and paid for with a tremendous expenditure of human lives. In any case, even as a restless mole under the soil of a society that wallows in stupidity, socialism will be able to be something useful and therapeutic: it delays "peace on earth" and the total mollification of the democratic herd animal; it forces the Europeans to retain spirit, namely cunning and cautious care, not to abjure manly and warlike virtues altogether, and to retain some remnant of spirit, of clarity, sobriety, and coldness of the spirit-it protects Europe for the time being from the *marasmus* [Withering: a Greek medical term found in Galen, the second-century (A.D.) physician.] *femininus* that threatens it.

126 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The *most favorable inhibitions and remedies of modernity:*

1. universal military service with real wars in which the time for joking is past;
2. national bigotry (simplifies, concentrates);
3. improved nutrition (meat);
4. increasing cleanliness and healthfulness of domiciles;
5. hegemony of physiology over theology, moralism, economics,and politics;
6. military severity in the demand for and handling of one's"obligations" (one does not praise any more-).

127 (1884)

I am *glad* about the military development of Europe; also of the internal states of anarchy: the time of repose and Chinese ossification, which Galiani predicted for this century, is over. Personal *manly virtù, virtù* of the body, is regaining value, estimation becomes more physical, nutrition meatier. Beautiful men are again becoming possible. Pallid hypocrisy (with mandarins at the top, as Comte dreamed) is over. The barbarian in each of us is affirmed; also the wild beast. Precisely for that reason philosophers have a future.-Kant is a scarecrow, some day!

128 (1884)

I have as yet found *no* reason for discouragement. Whoever has preserved, and bred in himself, a strong will, together with an ample spirit, has more favorable opportunities than ever. For the trainability of men has become very great in this democratic Europe; men who learn easily and adapt themselves easily are the rule: the herd animal, even highly intelligent, has been prepared. Whoever can command finds those who *must* obey: I am thinking, e.g., of Napoleon and Bismarck. The rivalry with strong and *un*intelligent wills, which is the greatest obstacle, is small. Who doesn't topple these "objective" gentlemen with weak wills, like Ranke or Renan!

129 (1885)

Spiritual enlightenment is an infallible means for making men unsure, weaker in will, so they are more in need of company and support-in short, for developing the *herd animal* in man. Therefore all great artists of government so far (Confucius in China, the *imperium Romanum,* Napoleon, the papacy at the time when it took an interest in power and not merely in the world), in the places where the dominant instincts have culminated so far, also employed spiritual enlightenment-at least let it have its way (like the popes of the Renaissance). The self-deception of the mass concerning this point, e.g., in every democracy, is extremely valuable: making men smaller and more governable is desired as "progress"!

130 (1883-1888)

The highest equity and mildness as a state of *weakening* (the New Testament and the original Christian community-apparent as complete *bêtise* [Stupidity.] in the Englishmen, Darwin and Wallace [Alfred Russell

Wallace (1823-1913).]). Your equity, you higher natures, impels you toward *suffrage universel,* etc.; your "humanity," toward mildness confronted with crime and stupidity. In the *long run* you thus make stupidity and the unscrupulous victorious: comfort and stupidity-*the mean.*
Externally: age of tremendous wars, upheavals, explosions.
Internally: ever greater weakness of man, *events as excitants.* The Parisian as the European extreme.
Consequences: (1) *barbarians* (at first, of course, below the form of culture so far [e.g., Dühring]); (2) *sovereign individuals* (where masses of barbarian force are crossed with a lack of all restraint regarding whatever has been). Age of the greatest stupidity, brutality, and the *masses,* and of the *highest individuals.*

131 (1884)

Innumerable individuals of a higher type now perish: but whoever *gets away* is strong as the devil. Similar to the situation at the time of the Renaissance.

132 (1885)

Good Europeans that we are-what distinguishes us above the men of fatherlands?-First, we are atheists and immoralists, but for the present we support the religions and moralities of the herd instinct: for these prepare a type of man that must one day fall into our hands, that must *desire* our hands.
Beyond good and evil-but we demand that herd morality should be held sacred unconditionally.
We hold in reserve many types of philosophy which need to be taught: possibly, the pessimistic type, as a hammer; a European Buddhism might perhaps be indispensable.
We probably support the development and maturing of democratic institutions: they enhance weakness of the will: in socialism we see a thorn that protects against comfortableness.
Position toward peoples. Our preferences; we pay attention to the results of interbreeding.
Apart, wealthy, strong: irony at the expense of the "press" and its culture. Worry lest scholars become journalistic. We feel contemptuous of every kind of culture that is compatible with reading, not to speak of writing for, newspapers.
We take our accidental positions (like Goethe, Stendhal), our experiences, as foreground and stress them to deceive about our depths. We ourselves are *waiting* and beware of staking our hearts on them. They serve us as hostels for a night, which a wanderer needs and accepts-we beware of settling down.
We are ahead of our fellow men in possessing a *disciplina voluntaris.* All strength applied to development of *strength of the will,* an art that permits us to wear masks, an art of understanding *beyond* the affects (also to think in a "supra-European" way, at times).
Preparation for becoming the legislators of the future, the masters of the earth, at least our children. Basic concern with marriages.

133 (1885)

The twentieth century.-Abbé Galiani once said: *La prévoyance est la cause der guerres actuelles de l'Europe. Si l'on voulait se donner la peine de ne rien prévoir, tout le monde serait tranquille, et je ne crois pas qu'on serait plus malheureux parce qu'on ne ferait pas la guerre.* [Foresight is the cause of Europe's present wars. If one would take pains to foresee nothing, the whole world would be tranquil, and I do not believe that one would be worse off for not waging war."] Since I do not by any means share the unwarlike views of my friend Galiani, I am not afraid of predicting a few things and thus, possibly, of conjuring up the cause of wars.
A tremendous *stock-taking* after the most terrible earthquake: with new questions.

134 (1885-1886)

This is the time of the *great noon, of the most terrible* clearing up: my type of pessimism-great point of departure.
I. Basic contradiction in civilization and the enhancement of man.
II. Moral valuations as a history of lies and the art of slander in the service of a will to power (the herd *will* that rebels against the human beings who are stronger).
III. The conditions of every enhancement of culture (making possible a *selection* at the expense of a mass) are the conditions of all growth.
IV. The *multiple ambiguity* of the world as a question of *strength* that sees all things in the *perspective of its growth.* Moral-Christian value judgments as slaves' rebellion and slaves' mendaciousness (against the aristocratic values of the *ancient* world). How far does art reach down into the essence of strength?

BOOK II: CRITIQUE OF HIGHEST VALUES HITHERTO

I. Critique of Religion

1. Genesis of Religions

142

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

Toward a critique of the law-book of Manu.- The whole book is founded on the holy lie. Was the well-being of mankind the inspiration of this system? Was this species of man, who believes in the interestedness of every action, interested or not in imposing this system? To improve mankind-how is this intention inspired? Where is the concept of improvement derived from?

We find a species of man, the priestly, which feels itself to be the norm, the high point and the supreme expression of the type man: this species derives the concept "improvement" from itself. It believes in its own superiority, it wills itself to be superior in fact: the origin of the holy lie is the *will to power*-

Establishment of rule: to this end, the rule of those concepts that place a *non plus ultra* of power with the priesthood. Power through the lie-in the knowledge that one does not possess it physically, militarily-the lie as a supplement to power, a new concept of "truth."

It is a mistake to suppose an *unconscious and naive* development here, a kind of self-deception- Fanatics do not invent such carefully thought-out systems of oppression- The most cold-blooded reflection was at work here; the same kind of reflection as a Plato applied when he imagined his "Republic." "He who wills the end must will the means"-all lawgivers have been clear in their minds regarding this politician's insight.

We possess the classic model in specifically *Aryan* forms: we may therefore hold the best-endowed and most reflective species of man responsible for the most fundamental lie that has ever been told- That lie has been copied almost everywhere: *Aryan influence* has corrupted all the world-

143

(March-June 1888)

A lot is said today about the *Semitic* spirit of the New Testament: but what is called Semitic is merely priestly-and in the racially purest Aryan law-book, in Manu, this kind of "Semitism," i.e., the *spirit of the priest,* is worse than anywhere else.

The development of the Jewish priestly state is *not* original: they learned the pattern in Babylon: the pattern is Aryan. When, later on, the same thing became dominant in a Europe with a preponderance of Germanic blood, this was in accordance with the spirit of the *ruling* race: a great atavism. The Germanic Middle Ages aimed at a revival of the Aryan order of castes.

Mohammedanism in turn learned from Christianity: the employment of the "beyond" as an instrument of punishment.

The pattern of an unchanging community with priests at its head-this oldest of the great cultural products of Asia in the realm of organization-was bound to invite reflection and imitation in every respect. Again Plato: but above all the Egyptians.

144

(1885)

Moralities and religions are the principal means by which one can make whatever one wishes out of man, provided one possesses a superfluity of creative forces and can assert one's will over long periods of time-in the form of legislation, religions, and customs.

145

(1884-1888)

What an *affirmative* Aryan religion, the product of the *ruling* class, looks like: the law-book of Manu. (The deification of the feeling of power in Brahma: interesting that it arose among the warrior caste and was only transferred to the priests.)

What an *affirmative* Semitic religion, the product of the *ruling* class, looks like: the law-book of Mohammed, the older parts of the Old Testament. (Mohammedanism, as a religion for men, is deeply contemptuous of the sentimentality and mendaciousness of Christianity-which it feels to be a woman's religion.)

What a *negative* Semitic religion, the product of an *oppressed* class, looks like: the New Testament (-in Indian-Aryan terms: a chandala religion).

What a *negative* Aryan religion looks like, grown up among the *ruling* orders: Buddhism.

It is quite in order that we possess no religion of oppressed Aryan races, for that is a contradiction: a master race is either on top or it is destroyed.

151

(1885-1886)

Religions are destroyed by belief in morality. The Christian moral God is not tenable: hence "atheism"-as if there could be no other kinds of god.

Similarly, culture is destroyed by belief in morality. For when one discovers the necessary conditions out of which alone it can grow, one no longer wants it (Buddhism).

2. History of Christianity

168

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

-The church is precisely that against which Jesus preached-and against which he taught his disciples to fight-

169

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

A god who died for our sins: redemption through faith; resurrection after death-all these are counterfeits of true Christianity for which that disastrous wrong-headed fellow [Paul] must be held responsible.

The exemplary life consists of love and humility; in a fullness of heart that does not exclude even the lowliest; in a formal repudiation of maintaining one's rights, of self-defense, of victory in the sense of personal triumph; in faith in blessedness here on earth, in spite of distress, opposition and death; in reconciliation; in the absence of anger; not wanting to be rewarded; not being obliged to anyone; the completest spiritual-intellectual independence; a very proud life beneath the will to a life of poverty and service.

After the church had let itself be deprived of the entire Christian way of life and had quite specifically sanctioned life under the state, that form of life that Jesus had combatted and condemned, it had to find the meaning of Christianity in something else: in faith in unbelievable things, in the ceremonial of prayers, worship, feasts, etc. The concept "sin," "forgiveness," "reward"-all quite unimportant and virtually excluded from primitive Christianity-now comes into the foreground.

An appalling mishmash of Greek philosophy and Judaism; asceticism; continual judging and condemning; order of rank, etc.

191

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Christians have never put into practice the acts Jesus prescribed for them, and the impudent chatter about "justification by faith" and its unique and supreme significance is only the consequence of the church's lack of courage and will to confess the *works* which Jesus demanded.

The Buddhist acts differently from the non-Buddhist; *the Christian acts as all the world does* and possesses a Christianity of ceremonies and *moods.*

The profound and contemptible mendaciousness of Christianity in Europe-: we really are becoming the contempt of the Arabs, Hindus, Chinese- Listen to the speeches of German's first statesman on what has really occupied Europe for forty years now-listen to the language, the court-chaplain Tartuffery.

3. Christian Ideals

II. Critique of Morality

1. Origin of Moral Valuations
2. The Herd
3. General Remarks on Morality
4. How Virtue is Made to Dominate
5. The Moral Ideal

A. Critique of Ideals

338

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

What is the *counterfeiting* aspect of morality?- It pretends to *know* something, namely what "good and evil" is. That means wanting to know why mankind is here, its goal, its destiny. That means wanting to know that mankind *has* a goal, a destiny-

339

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The very obscure and arbitrary idea that mankind has a single task to perform, that it is moving as a whole towards some goal, is still very young. Perhaps we shall be rid of it again before it becomes a "fixed idea"-
This mankind is not a whole: it is an inextricable multiplicity of ascending and descending life-processes- it does not have a youth followed by maturity and finally by old age; the strata are twisted and entwined together-and in a few millennia there may still be even younger types of man than we can show today. Decadence, on the other hand, belongs to all epochs of mankind: refuse and decaying matter are found everywhere; it is one of life's processes to exclude the forms of decline and decay.

*

When Christian prejudice was a power, this question did not exist: meaning lay in the salvation of the individual soul; whether mankind could endure for a long or a short time did not come into consideration. The best Christians desired that it should end as soon as possible-concerning that which was needful to the individual there was no doubt-
The task of every present individual was the same as for a future individual in any kind of future: value, meaning, domain of values were fixed, unconditional, eternal, one with God- That which deviated from this eternal type was sinful, devilish, condemned-
For each soul, the gravitational center of valuation was placed within itself: salvation or damnation! The salvation of the *immortal* soul! Extremest form of personalization- For every soul there was only one perfecting; only one ideal; only one way to redemption- Extremest form of equality of rights, tied to an optical magnification of one's own importance to the point of insanity- Nothing but insanely important souls, revolving about themselves with a frightful fear-

*

No man believes now in this absurd self-inflation: and we have sifted our wisdom through a sieve of contempt. Nevertheless, the optical habit of seeking the value of man in his approach to an ideal man remains undisturbed: fundamentally, one upholds the perspective of personalization as well as equality of rights before the ideal. *In summa:* one believes one knows what the ultimate *desideratum* is with regard to the ideal man-
This belief, however, is only the consequence of a dreadful deterioration through the Christian ideal: as one at once discovers with every careful examination of the "ideal type." One believes one knows, *first* that an approach to one type is desirable; *secondly,* that one knows what this type is like; *thirdly,* that every deviation from this type is a regression, an inhibition, a loss of force and power in man-
To dream of conditions in which this perfect man will be in the vast majority: even our socialists, even the Utilitarians have not gone farther than this.-
In this way a goal seems to have entered the development of mankind: at any rate, the belief in progress towards the ideal is the only form in which a goal in history is thought of today. *In summa:* one has transferred the arrival of the "kingdom of God" into the future, on earth, in human form-but fundamentally one has held fast to the belief in the *old* ideal-

B. Critique of the "Good Man," the Saint, etc.

352

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The concept of power, whether of a god or of a man, always includes both the ability to help and the ability to harm. Thus it is with the Arabs; thus with the Hebrews. Thus with all strong races.
It is a fateful step when one separates the power for the one from the power for the other into a dualism- In this way, morality becomes the poisoner of life-

C. Disagreement of the So-Called Evil Qualities

377

(1883-1888)

Falsity.-Every sovereign instinct has the others for its tools, retainers, flatterers: it never lets itself be called by its *ugly* name: and it countenances no praise in which it is not also praised indirectly. All praise and blame in general crystallizes around every sovereign instinct to form a rigorous order and etiquette. This is *one* of the causes of falsity.
Every instinct that struggles for mastery but finds itself under a yoke requires for itself, as strengthening and as support for its self-esteem, all the beautiful names and recognized values: so, as a rule, it ventures forth under the name of the "master" it is combatting and from whom it wants to get free (e.g.,

the fleshly desires or the desires for power under the dominion of Christian values).- This is the *other* cause of falsity.
Perfect naïveté reigns in both cases: the falsity does not become conscious. It is a sign of a broken instinct when man sees the driving force and its "expression" ("the mask") as separate things-a sign of self-contradiction, and victorious far less often. Absolute innocence in bearing, word, affect, a "good conscience" in falsity, the certainty with which one grasps the greatest and most splendid words and postures-all this is necessary for victory.
In the other case: when one has extreme clear-sightedness one needs the genius of the actor and tremendous training in self-control if one is to achieve victory. That is why priests are the most skillful *conscious* hypocrites; then princes, whom rank and ancestry have endowed with a kind of acting ability. Thirdly, men of society, diplomats. Fourthly, women.
Basic idea: falsity seems so profound, so omnisided, the will so clearly opposed to direct self-knowledge and the calling of things by their right names, that it is very highly probable that truth, will to truth is really something else and only a disguise. (The need for faith is the greatest brake-shoe on truthfulness.)

380

(Spring-Fall 1887)

1. Systematic falsification of history; so that it may provide the proof of moral valuation:
   a. decline of a people and corruption;
   b. rise of a people and virtue;
   c. zenith of a people ("its culture") as a consequence of moral elevation.
2. Systematic falsification of great human beings, the great creators, the great epochs:
   one desires that faith should be the distinguishing mark of the great: but slackness, skepticism, "immorality," the right to throw off a faith, belong to greatness (Caesar, also Homer, Aristophanes, Leonardo, Goethe). One always suppresses the main thing, their "freedom of will"-

382

(Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

Schopenhauer interpreted high intellectuality as liberation from the will; he did not *want* to see the freedom from moral prejudice which is part of the emancipation of the great spirit, the typical immorality of the genius; he artfully posited the only thing he held in honor, the moral value of "depersonalization," as the condition of spiritual activity, of "objective" viewing. "Truth," even in art, appears after the withdrawal of the will-
I see a fundamentally different valuation cutting across all the moral idiosyncrasies: I know nothing of such an absurd distinction between "genius" and the moral and immoral world of the will. The moral man is a lower species than the immoral, a weaker species; indeed-he is a type in regard to morality, but not a type in himself; a copy, a good copy at best-the measure of his value lies outside him. I assess a man by the quantum of power and abundance of his will: not by its enfeeblement and extinction; I regard a philosophy which teaches denial of the will as a teaching of defamation and slander- I assess the *power* of a *will* by how much resistance, pain, torture it endures and knows how to turn to its advantage; I do not account the evil and painful character of existence a reproach to it, but hope rather that it will one day be more evil and painful than hitherto-
The high point of the spirit imagined by Schopenhauer was to attain to the recognition that there is no meaning in anything, in short, to *recognize* what the good man already instinctively *does*- He denies the possibility of a higher kind of intellect-he took his insight for a *non plus ultra.* Here spirituality is placed much lower than goodness; its highest value (e.g., as art) would be to urge and prepare moral conversion: absolute domination of moral values.-
Beside Schopenhauer I would characterize *Kant:* nothing Greek, absolutely antihistorical (his passage on the French Revolution) and a moral fanatic (Goethe's passage on radical evil). Saintliness was in the background in his case, too.
I need a critique of the *saint*-
Hegel's value. "Passion."-
Shopkeeper's philosophy of Mr. Spencer; complete absence of an ideal, except that of the mediocre man.
Fundamental instinctive principle of all philosophers and historians and psychologists: everything of value in man, art, history, science, religion, technology must be proved to be of *moral value, morally* conditioned, in aim, means and outcome. Everything understood in the light of the supreme value: e.g.,

Rousseau's question concerning civilization: "Does man become *better* through it?"-an amusing question, since the reverse is obvious and is precisely that which speaks in *favor* of civilization.

383

(March-June 1888)

Religious morality.- Affect, great desire, the passion for power, love, revenge, possessions-: moralists want to extinguish and uproot them, to "purify" the soul of them.

The logic is: the desires often produce great misfortune-consequently they are evil, reprehensible. A man must free himself from them: otherwise he cannot be a *good* man-

This is the same logic as: "if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out.: In the particular case in which that dangerous "innocent from the country," the founder of Christianity, recommended this practice to his disciples, the case of sexual excitation, the consequence is, unfortunately, not only the loss of an organ but the *emasculation* of a man's character- And the same applies to the moralist's madness that demands, instead of the restraining of the passions, their extirpation. Its conclusion is always: only the castrated man is a good man.

Instead of taking into service the great sources of strength, those impetuous torrents of the soul that are so often dangerous and overwhelming, and economizing them, this most shortsighted and pernicious mode of thought, the moral mode of thought, wants to make them dry up.

384

(1885-1886)

Overcoming of the affects?- No, if what is implied is their weakening and extirpation. But putting them into service: which may also mean subjecting them to a protracted tyranny (not only as an individual, but as a community, race, etc.). At last they are confidently granted freedom again: they love us as good servants and go voluntarily wherever our best interests lie.

385

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Moral intolerance is an expression of weakness in a man: he is afraid of his own "immorality," he must deny his strongest drives because he does not yet know how to employ them. Thus the most fruitful regions of the earth remain uncultivated the longest:- the force is lacking that could here become master-

386

(Spring-Fall 1887)

There are very naive people and men who believe that continual fine weather is something desirable: even today they believe, in *rebus moralibus,* [Moral matters.] that the "good man," and nothing but the "good man," is something desirable-and that the course of human evolution is directed toward the survival of the "good man" only (and that one must bend all one's efforts in that direction-). This is in the highest degree an *uneconomic* thought and, as stated, the acme of naïveté, nothing but the expression of the pleasing effect produced by the "good man" (he arouses no fear, he permits one to relax, he gives what one is able to take).

From a superior viewpoint one desires the contrary: the ever-increasing dominion of evil, the growing emancipation of man from the narrow and fear-ridden bonds of morality, the increase of force, in order to press the mightiest natural powers-the affects-into service.

387

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The whole conception of an order of rank among the passions: as if the right and normal thing were for one to be guided by reason-with the passions as abnormal, dangerous, semi-animal, and, moreover, so far as their aim is concerned, nothing other than desires for pleasure-

Passion is degraded (1) as if it were only in unseemly cases, and not necessarily and always, the motive force; (2) in as much as it has for its object something of no great value, amusement-

The misunderstanding of passion and reason, as if the latter were an independent entity and not rather a system of relations between various passions and desires; and as if every passion did not possess its quantum of reason-

388

(Spring-Fall 1887)

How, under the impress of the ascetic morality of depersonalization, it was precisely the affects of love, goodness, pity, even those of justice, magnanimity, heroism, that were necessarily misunderstood:

It is richness in personality, abundance in oneself, overflowing and bestowing, instinctive good health and affirmation of oneself, that produce great sacrifice and great love: it is strong and godlike selfhood

from which these affects grow, just as surely as did the desire to become master, encroachment, the inner certainty of having a right to everything. What according to common ideas are opposite dispositions are rather *one* disposition; and if one is not firm and brave within oneself, one has nothing to bestow and cannot stretch our one's hand to protect and support-

How was one able so to transform these instincts that man thought valuable that which was directed against his self? when he sacrificed his self to another self. Oh the psychological wretchedness and mendaciousness that has hitherto laid down the law in the church and in church-infected philosophy!

If man is sinful through and through, then he ought only to hate himself. Fundamentally, he would have to treat his fellow men on the same basis as he treats himself; charity needs to be justified-its justification lies in the fact that God has commanded it.- It follows from this, that all the natural instincts of man (the instinct of love, etc.) appear to be forbidden in themselves and only after they have been denied are they restored to their rights on the basis of obedience to God-Pascal, the admirable logician of Christianity, went so far! consider his relations to his sister. *"Not* to make oneself love" seemed Christian to him.

D. Critique of the Words: Improvement, Perfecting, Elevation

398

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

What I want to make clear by all the means in my power:

a. that there is no worse confusion than the confusion of breeding with taming: which is what has been done- Breeding, as I understand it, is a means of storing up the tremendous forces of mankind so that the generations can build upon the work of their forefathers-not only outwardly, but inwardly, organically growing out of them and becoming something stronger-

b. that it is extraordinarily dangerous to believe that mankind as a whole will progress and grow stronger if individuals become flabby, equal, average- Mankind is an abstraction: the goal of breeding, even in the case of a single individual, can only be the *stronger* man (-the man without breeding is weak, extravagant, unstable-).

6. Further Considerations for a Critique of Morality

III. Critique of Philosophy

1. General Observations

410

(1885-1886)

For the Preface

Deeply mistrustful of the dogmas of epistemology, I loved to look now out of this window, now out of that; I guarded against settling down with any of these dogmas, considered them harmful-and finally: is it likely that a tool is *able* to criticize its own fitness?- What I noticed was rather that no epistemological skepticism or dogmatism had ever arisen free from ulterior motives-that it acquires a value of the second rank as soon as one has considered what it was that *compelled* the adoption of this point of view.

Fundamental insight: Kant as well as Hegel and Schopenhauer-the skeptical-epochistic attitude as will as the historicizing, as well as the pessimistic-have a *moral* origin. I saw no one who had ventured a critique of moral value feelings: and I soon turned my back one the meager attempts made to arrive at a description of the origin of these feelings (as by the English and German Darwinists).

How can Spinoza's position, his denial and rejection of moral value judgments, be explained? (It was one consequence of his theodicy!)

413

(1885)

Ulterior moral motives have hitherto most obstructed the course of philosophy.

423

(March-June 1888)

Theory and practice.- Fateful distinction, as if there were an actual *drive for knowledge* that, without regard to questions of usefulness and harm, went blindly for the truth; and then, separate from this, the whole world of *practical* interests-

I tried to show, on the other hand, what instincts have been active behind all these *pure* theoreticians-how they have all, under the spell of their instincts, gone fatalistically for something that was "truth" *for them*-for them and only for them. The conflict between different systems, including that between epistemological scruples, is a conflict between quite definite instincts (forms of vitality, decline, classes, races, etc.).
The so-called drive for knowledge can be traced back to a drive to appropriate and conquer: the senses, the memory, the instincts, etc. have developed as a consequence of this drive. The quickest possible reduction of the phenomena, economy, the accumulation of the spoils of knowledge (i.e., of world appropriated and made manageable)-
Morality is such a curious science because it is in the highest degree *practical:* so that the position of pure knowledge, scientific integrity, is at once abandoned as soon as the claims of morality must be answered. Morality says: I *need* many answers-reasons, arguments; scruples can come afterward, or not at all-.
"How should one act?"- If one considers that one is dealing with a sovereignly developed type that has "acted" for countless millennia, and in which everything has become instinct, expediency, automatism, fatality, then the urgency of this moral question must actually seem ridiculous.
"How should one act?"- Morality has always been a misunderstanding: in reality, a species fated to act in this or that fashion wanted to justify itself, by dictating its norm as the universal norm-
"How should one act?" is not a cause but an effect. Morality follows, the ideal comes at the end.
-On the other hand, the appearance of moral scruples (in other words: the becoming-conscious of the values by which one acts) betrays a certain sickliness; strong ages and peoples do not reflect on their rights, on the principles on which they act, on their instincts and reasons. Becoming-conscious is a sign that real morality, i.e., instinctive certainty in actions, is going to the devil- Every time a new world of consciousness is created, the moralists are a sign of damage, impoverishment, disorganization.- The deeply instinctive are shy of logicizing duties: among them are found Pyrrhic opponents of dialectics and of knowability in general- A virtue is *refuted* with a "for"-
Thesis: the appearance of moralists belongs to an age in which morality is coming to an end.
Thesis: the moralist disintegrates the moral instincts, however much he may suppose himself to be their restorer.
Thesis: that which really drives the moralist is not the moral instincts but the *instincts of decadence* translated into the formulas of morality- (he regards it as corruption when the instincts become uncertain).
Thesis: the *instincts of decadence*, which, through the moralists, want to become master over the instinctive morality of strong races and ages, are

1. the instincts of the weak and underprivileged;
2. the instincts of the exceptions, the solitaries, the abandoned, of the *abortus* [Abortion.] in what is lofty and what is petty.
3. the instincts of those habituated to suffering, who need a noble interpretation of their condition and therefore must know as little as possible about physiology.

2. Critique of Greek Philosophy

428

(March-June 1888)

How far psychologists have been corrupted by the moral idiosyncrasy:-not one of the ancient philosophers had the courage for a theory of the "unfree will" (i.e., for a theory that denies morality);-no one had the courage to define the typical element in pleasure, every sort of pleasure ("happiness") as the feeling of power: for to take pleasure in power was considered immoral;-no one had the courage to conceive virtue as a consequence of immorality (of a will to power) in the service of the species (or of the race or *polis*), for the will to power was considered immorality.
In the entire evolution of morality, truth never appears: all the conceptual elements employed are fictions; all the *psychologica* accepted are falsifications; all the forms of logic dragged into this realm of lies are sophistries. What distinguishes moral philosophers themselves is a complete absence of cleanliness and intellectual self-discipline: they take "beautiful feelings" for arguments: they regard their "heaving bosom" as the bellows of divinity- Moral philosophy is the scabrous period in the history of the spirit.
The first great example: in the name of morality, under the patronage of morality, an unheard-of wrong was perpetrated, in fact a piece of decadence in every respect. One cannot insist too strongly upon the

fact that the great Greek philosophers represent the decadence of every kind of Greek excellence and make it contagious- "Virtue" made completely abstract was the greatest seduction to make oneself abstract: i.e., to detach oneself.
It is a very remarkable moment: the Sophists verge upon the first *critique of morality,* the first *insight* into morality:-they juxtapose the multiplicity (the geographical relativity) of the moral value judgments;-they let it be known that every morality can be dialectically justified; i.e., they divine that all attempts to give reasons for morality are necessarily *sophistical*-a proposition later proved on the grand scale by the ancient philosophers, from Plato onwards (down to Kant);-they postulate the first truth that a "morality-in-itself," a "good-in-itself" do not exist, that it is a swindle to talk of "truth" in this field.
Where was intellectual integrity in those days?
The Greek culture of the Sophists had developed out of all the Greek instincts; it belongs to the culture of the Periclean age as necessarily as Plato does *not:* it has its predecessors in Heraclitus, in Democritus, in the scientific types of the old philosophy; it finds expression in, e.g., the high culture of Thucydides. And-it has ultimately shown itself to be right: every advance in epistemological and moral knowledge has reinstated the Sophists- Our contemporary way of thinking is to a great extent Heraclitean, Democritean, and Protagorean: it suffices to say Protagorean, because Protagoras represented a synthesis of Heraclitus and Democritus.
(Plato: a great Cagliostro-remember how Epicurus judged him; how Timon, the friend of Pyrrho, judged him-- Is Plato's integrity beyond question?- But we know at least that he wanted to have *taught* as absolute truth what he himself did not regard as even conditionally true: namely, the separate existence and separate immortality of "souls.")

430

(March-June 1888)

The great rationality of all education in morality has always been that one tried to attain to the certainty of an instinct: so that neither good intentions nor good means had to enter consciousness as such. As the soldier exercises, so should man learn to act. In fact, this unconsciousness belongs to any kind of perfection: even the mathematician employs his combinations unconsciously-
What, then, is the significance of the reaction of Socrates, who recommended dialectics as the road to virtue and made mock when morality did not know how to justify itself logically?- As if this were not part of its value-without consciousness it is no good-
Positing proofs as the presupposition for personal excellence in virtue signified nothing less than the disintegration of Greek instincts. They are themselves types of disintegration, all these great "virtuous men" and word-spinners.
In praxi, this means that moral judgments are torn from their conditionality, in which they have grown and alone possess any meaning, from their Greek and Greek-political ground and soil, to be denaturalized under the pretense of sublimation. The great concepts "good" and "just" are severed from the presuppositions to which they belong and, as liberated "ideas," become objects of dialectic. One looks for truth in them, one takes them for entities or signs of entities: one *invents* a world where they are at home, where they originate-
In summa: the mischief has already reached its climax in Plato- And then one had need to invent the abstractly perfect man as well:-good, just, wise, a dialectician-in short, the scarecrow of the ancient philosopher: a plant removed from all soil; a humanity without any particular regulating instincts; a virtue that "proves" itself with reasons. The perfectly absurd "individuum" in itself! unnaturalness of the first water-
In short, the consequence of the denaturalization of moral values was the creation of a degenerate type of man-"the good man," "the happy man," "the wise man."- Socrates represents a moment of the profoundest perversity in the history of values.

440

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

When morality-that is to say subtlety, caution, bravery, equity-has been as it were stored up through the practice of a whole succession of generations, then the total force of this accumulated virtue radiates even into that sphere where integrity is most seldom found, into the spiritual sphere. In all becoming-conscious there is expressed a discomfiture of the organism; it has to try something new, nothing is sufficiently adapted for it, there is toil, tension, strain-all this *constitutes* becoming-conscious-
Genius resides in instinct; goodness likewise. One acts perfectly only when one acts instinctively. Even from the viewpoint of morality, all conscious thinking is merely tentative, usually the reverse of morality.

Scientific integrity is always ruptured when the thinker begins to reason: try the experiment of putting the wisest men on the most delicate scales by making them talk about morality-
It could be proved that all conscious thinking would also show a far lower standard of morality than the thinking of the same man when it is directed by his instincts.

3. Truth and Error of Philosophers

456

(March-June 1888)

A certain degree of faith serves us today as an *objection* to what is believed-even more as a question mark against the spiritual health of the believer.

4. Further Considerations for a Critique of Philosophy

462

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Fundamental innovations: In place of "moral values," purely naturalistic values. Naturalization of morality.
In place of "sociology," a theory of the forms of domination.
In place of "society," the culture complex, as my chief interest (as a whole or in its parts).
In place of "epistemology," a perspective theory of affects (to which belongs a hierarchy of the affects; the affects transfigured; their superior order, their "spirituality").
In place of "metaphysics," and religion, the theory of eternal recurrence (this as a means of breeding and selection).

BOOK III
Principles of a New Valuation
I. The Will to Power as Knowledge
1. Method of Inquiry

466 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

It is not the victory of science that distinguishes our nineteenth century, but the victory of scientific method over science.

467 (Spring-Fall 1887)

History of scientific method, considered by Auguste Comte as virtually philosophy itself.

468 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The great methodologists: Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Auguste Comte.

469 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The most valuable insights are arrived at last; but the most valuable insights are *methods.*
All the methods, all the presuppositions of our contemporary science were for millennia regarded with the profoundest contempt; on their account one was excluded from the society of respectable people-one was considered as an "enemy of God," as a reviler of the highest ideal, as "possessed."
We have had the whole pathos of mankind against us-our conception of what "truth" should be, what service of truth should be, our objectivity, our method, our silent, cautious, mistrustful ways were considered perfectly contemptible-
At bottom, it has been an aesthetic taste that has hindered mankind most: it believed in the picturesque effect of truth, it demanded of the man of knowledge that he should produce a powerful effect on the imagination.
This looks as if an antithesis has been achieved, a leap made; in reality, the schooling through moral hyperbole prepared the way step by step for that milder of pathos that became incarnate in the scientific character-
The conscientiousness in small things, the self-control of the religious man were a preparatory school for the scientific character: above all, the disposition that takes problems seriously, regardless of the personal consequences-

2. The Epistemological Starting Point

470 (1885-1886)

Profound aversion to reposing once and for all in any one total view of the world. Fascination of the opposing point of view: refusal to be deprived of the stimulus of the enigmatic.

471 (1885-1886)

The presupposition that things are, at bottom, ordered so morally that human reason must be justified-is an ingenuous presupposition and a piece of naiveté, the after-effect of belief in God's veracity-God understood as the creator of things.-These concepts an inheritance from a former existence in a beyond--

472 (1883-1888)

Contradiction of the alleged "facts of consciousness." Observation is a thousand times more difficult, error perhaps a condition of observation in general.

473 (1886-1887)

The intellect cannot criticize itself, simply because it cannot be compared with other species of intellect and because its capacity to know would be revealed only in the presence of "true reality," i.e., because in order to criticize the intellect we should have to be a higher being with "absolute knowledge." This presupposes that, distinct from every perspective kind of outlook or sensual-spiritual appropriation, something exists, an "in-it-self."-But the psychological derivation of the belief in things forbids us to speak of "things-in-themselves ." [See 486.]

474 (Nov.1887-March 1888)

That a sort of adequate relationship subsists between subject and object, that the object is something that if seen from within would be a subject, is a well-meant invention which, I think, has had its day. The measure of that of which we are in any way conscious is totally dependent upon the coarse utility of its becoming-conscious: how could this nook-perspective of consciousness permit us to assert anything of "subject" and "object" that touched reality!-

475 (1885-1886)

Critique of modern philosophy: erroneous starting point, as if there existed "facts of consciousness"-and no phenomenalism in introspection.

476 (1884)

"Consciousness"-to what extent the idea of an idea, the idea of will, the idea of a feeling (known to ourselves alone) are totally superficial! Our inner world, too, "appearance"!

477 (Nov.1887-March 1888)

I maintain the phenomenality of the inner world, too: everything of which we become conscious is arranged, simplified, schematized, interpreted through and through-the actual process of inner "perception," the causal connection between thoughts, feelings, desires, between subject and object, are absolutely hidden from us-and are perhaps purely imaginary. The "apparent*inner* world" is governed by just the same forms and procedures as the "outer" world. We never encounter "facts": pleasure and displeasure are subsequent and derivative intellectual phenomena-

"Causality" eludes us; to suppose a direct causal link beween thoughts, as logic does-that is the consequence of the crudest and clumsiest observation. Between two thoughts all kinds of affects play their game: but their motions are too fast, therefore we fail to recognize them, we deny them-

"Thinking," as epistemologists conceive it, simply does not occur: it is a quite arbitrary fiction, arrived at by selecting one element from the process and eliminating all the rest, an artificial arrangement for the purpose of intelligibility-

The "spirit," something that thinks: where possible even "absolute, pure spirit"-this conception is a second derivative of that false introspection which believes in "thinking": first an act is imagined which simply does not occur, "thinking," and secondly a subject-substratum in which every act of thinking, and nothing else, has its origin: that is to say, both the deed and the doer are fictions.

478 (March-June 1888)

One must not look for phenomenalism in the wrong place: nothing is more phenomenal (or, more clearly:) nothing is so much deception as this inner world which we observe with the famous "inner sense."

We have believed in the will as cause to such an extent that we have from our personal experience introduced a cause into events in general (i.e., intention a cause of events-).

We believe that thoughts as they succeed one another in our minds stand in some kind of causal relation: the logician especially, who actually speaks of nothing but instances which never occur in reality, has grown accustomed to the prejudice that thoughts *cause* thoughts-.

We believe-and even our philosopers still believe-that pleasure and pain are causes of reactions, that the purpose of pleasure and pain is to occasion reactions. For millennia, pleasure and the avoidance of displeasure have been flatly asserted as the *motives* for every action. Upon reflection, however, we should concede that everything would have taken the same course, according to exactly the same sequence of causes and effects, if these states "pleasure and displeasure" had been absent, and that one is simply deceiving oneself if one thinks they cause anything at all: they are epiphenomena with a quite different object than to evoke reactions; they are themselves effects within the instituted process of reaction.

In summa: everything of which we become conscious is a terminal phenomenon, an end-and causes nothing; every successive phenomenon in consciousness is completely atomistic-And we have sought to understand the world through the reverse conception-as if nothing were real and effective but thinking, feeling, willing!-

479 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The phenomenalism of the "inner world." Chronological inversion, so that the cause enters consciousness later than the effect.-We have learned that pain is projected to a part of the body without being situated there-we have learned that sense impressions naively supposed to be conditioned by the outer world are, on the contrary, conditioned by the inner world; that we are always unconscious of the real activity of the outer world-The fragment of outer world of which we are conscious is born after an effect from outside has impressed itself upon us, and is subsequently projected as its "cause"-

In the phenomenalism of the "inner world" we invert the chronological order of cause and effect. The fundamental fact of "inner experience" is that the cause is imagined after the effect has taken place-The same applies to the succession of thoughts:-we seek the reason for a thought before we are conscious of it; and the reason enters consciousness first, and then its consequence-Our entire dream life is the interpretation of complex feelings with a view to possible causes-and in such way that we are conscious of a condition only when the supposed causal chain associated with it has entered consciousness.

The whole of "inner experience" rests upon the fact that a cause for an excitement of the nerve centers is sought and imagined-and that only a cause thus discovered enters consciousness: this cause in no way corresponds to the real cause-it is a groping on the basis of previous "inner experiences," i.e., of memory. But memory also maintains the habit of the old interpretations, i.e., of erroneous causality-so that the "inner experience" has to contain within it the consequences of all previous false causal fictions. Our "outer world" as we project it every moment is indissolubly tied to the old error of the ground: we interpret it by means of the schematism of "things," etc.

"Inner experience" enters our consciousness only after it has found a language the individual understands-i.e., a translation of a condition into conditions familiar to him-; "to understand" means merely: to be able to express something new in the language of something old and familiar. E.g., "I feel unwell"-such a judgment presupposes a great and late neutrality of the observer-; the simple man always says: this or that makes me feel unwell-he makes up his mind about his feeling unwell only when he has seen a reason for feeling unwell.-*I call that a lack of philology;* to be able to read off a text as a text without interposing an interpretation is the last-developed form of "inner experience"-perhaps one that is hardly possible-

480 (March-June 1888)

There exists neither "spirit," nor reason, nor thinking, nor consciousness, nor soul, nor will, nor truth: all are fictions that are of no use. There is no question of "subject and object," but of a particular species of animal that can prosper only through a certain relative rightness; above all, regularity of its perceptions (so that it can accumulate experience)-

Knowledge works as a tool of power. Hence it is plain that it increases with every increase of power-

The meaning of "knowledge": here, as in the case of "good" or "beautiful," the concept is to be regarded in a strict and narrow anthropocentric and biological sense. In order for a particular species to maintain itself and increase its power, its conception of reality must comprehend enough of the calculable and constant for it to base a scheme of behavior on it. The utility of preservation-not some abstract-theoretical need not to be deceived-stands as the motive behind the development of the organs of knowledge-they develop in such a way that their observations suffice for our preservation. In other words: the measure of the desire for knowledge depends upon the measure to which the will to power grows in a species: a species grasps a certain amount of reality in order to become master of it, in order to press it into service.

3. Belief in the "Ego." The Subject

481 (1883-1888)

Against positivism, which halts at phenomena-"There are only *facts"*-I would say: No, facts is precisely what there is not, only interpretations. We cannot establish any fact "in itself": perhaps it is folly to want to do such a thing.

"Everything is subjective," you say; but even this is interpretation. The "subject" is not something given, it is something added and invented and projected behind what there is.-Finally, is it necessary to posit an interpreter behind the interpretation? Even this is invention, hypothesis.

In so far as the word "knowledge" has any meaning, the world is knowable; but it is *interpretable* otherwise, it has no meaning behind it, but countless meanings.-"Perspectivism."

It is our needs that interpret the world; our drives and their For and Against. Every drive is a kind of lust to rule; each one has its perspective that it would like to compel all the other drives to accept as a norm.

482 (1886-1887)

We set up a word at the point at which our ignorance begins, at which we can see no further, e.g., the word "I," the word "do," the word "suffer":-these are perhaps the horizon of our knowledge, but not "truths."

483 (1885)

Through thought the ego is posited; but hitherto one believed as ordinary people do, that in "I think" there was something of immediate certainty, and that this "I" was the given *cause* of thought, from which by analogy we understood all other causal relationships. However habitual and indispensable this fiction may have become by now-that in itself proves nothing against its imaginary origin: a belief can be a condition of life and nonetheless be false.

484 (Spring-Fall 1887)

"There is thinking: therefore there is something that thinks": this is the upshot of all Descartes' argumentation. But that means positing as "true *a priori"* our belief in the concept of substance-that when there is thought there has to be something "that thinks" is simply a formulation of our grammatical custom that adds a doer to every deed. In short, this is not merely the substantiation of a fact but a logical-metaphysical postulate-Along the lines followed by Descartes one does not come upon something absolutely certain but only upon the fact of a very strong belief.

If one reduces the proposition to "There is thinking, therefore there are thoughts," one has produced a mere tautology: and precisely that which is in question, the "reality of thought," is not touched upon-that is, in this form the "apparent reality" of thought cannot be denied. But what Descartes desired was that thought should have, not an *apparent* reality, but a reality *in itself.*

485 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The concept of substance is a consequence of the concept of the subject: not the reverse! If we relinquish the soul, "the subject," the precondition for "substance" in general disappears. One acquires degrees of being, one loses that which *has* being.

Critique of "reality": where does the "more or less real," the gradation of being in which we believe, lead to?-

The degree to which we feel life and power (logic and coherence of experience) gives us our measure of "being," "reality," not-appearance.

The subject: this is the term for our belief in a unity underlying all the different impulses of the highest feeling of reality: we understand this belief as the *effect* of one cause-we believe so firmly in our belief that for its sake we imagine "truth," "reality," "substantiality" in general.- "The subject" is the fiction that many similar states in us are the effect of one substratum: but it is we who first created the "similarity" of these states; our adjusting them and making them similar is the fact, not their similarity (-which ought rather to be denied-).

486 (1885-1886)

One would have to know what *being* is, in order to decide whether this or that is real (e.g., "the facts of consciousness"); in the same way, what *certainty* is, what *knowledge* is, and the like.-But since we do not know this, a critique of the faculty of knowledge is senseless: how should a tool be able to criticize itself when it can use only itself for the critique? It cannot even define itself! [See 473.]

487 (1883-1886)

Must all philosophy not ultimately bring to light the preconditions upon which the process of reason depends?-our belief in the "ego" as a substance, as the sole reality from which we ascribe reality to things in general? The oldest "realism" at last comes to light: at the same time that the entire religious history of mankind is recognized as the history of the soul superstition. Here we come to a limit: our thinking itself involves this belief (with its distinction of substance, accident; deed, doer, etc.); to let it go means: being no longer able to think.

But that a belief, however necessary it may be for the preservation of a species, has nothing to do with truth, one knows from the fact that, e.g., we have to believe in time, space, and motion, without feeling compelled to grant them absolute reality.

488 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Psychological derivation of our belief in reason.-The concept "reality," "being," is taken from our feeling of the "subject."

"The subject": interpreted from within ourselves, so that the ego counts as a substance, as the cause of all deeds, as a doer.

The logical-metaphysical postulates, the belief in substance, accident, attribute, etc., derive their convincing force from our habit of regarding all our deeds as consequences of our will-so that the ego, as substance, does not vanish in the multiplicity of change.-But there is no such thing as will.-

We have no categories at all that permit us to distinguish a "world in itself" from a "world of appearance." All our categories of reason are of sensual origin: derived from the empirical world. "The soul," "the ego"-the history of these concepts shows that here, too, the oldest distinction ("breath," "life")-

If there is nothing material, there is also nothing immaterial. The concept no longer contains anything.

No subject "atoms." The sphere of a subject constantly growing or decreasing, the center of the system constantly shifting; in cases where it cannot organize the appropriate mass, it breaks into two parts. On the other hand, it can transform a weaker subject into its functionary without destroying it, and to a certain degree form a new unity with it. No "substance," rather something that in itself strives after greater strength, and that wants to "preserve" itself only indirectly (it wants to *surpass* itself-).

489 (1886-1887)

Everything that enters consciousness as "unity" is already tremendously complex: we always have only a semblance of unity.

The phenomenon of the body is the richer, clearer, more tangible phenomenon: to be discussed first, methodologically, without coming to any decision about its ultimate significance.

490 (1885)

The assumption of one single subject is perhaps unnecessary; perhaps it is just as permissible to assume a multiplicity of subjects, whose interaction and struggle is the basis of our thought and our consciousness in general? A kind of aristocracy of "cells" in which dominion resides? To be sure, an aristocracy of equals, used to ruling jointly and understanding how to command?

*My hypotheses:*The subject as multiplicity.

Pain intellectual and dependent upon the judgment "harmful": projected.

The effect always "unconscious": the inferred and imagined cause is projected, *follows* in time.

Pleasure is a kind of pain.

The only force that exists is of the same kind as that of the will: a commanding of other subjects, which thereupon change.

The continual transitoriness and fleetingness of the subject. "Mortal soul."

Number as perspective form.

491 (1885-1886)

Belief in the body is more fundamental than belief in the soul: the latter arose from unscientific reflection on [the agonies of] the body (something that leaves it. Belief in the truth of dreams-).

492 (1885)

The body and physiology the starting point: why?-We gain the correct idea of the nature of our subject-unity, namely as regents at the head of a communality (not as "souls" or "life forces"), also of the dependence of these regents upon the ruled and of an order of rank and division of labor as the conditions that make possible the whole and its parts. In the same way, how living unities continually arise and die and how the "subject" is not eternal; in the same way, that the struggle expresses itself in obeying and commanding, and that a fluctuating assessment of the limits of power is part of life. The relative ignorance in which the regent is kept concerning individual activities and even disturbances within the communality is among the conditions under which rule can be exercised. In short, we also gain a valuation of *not-knowing,* of seeing things on a broad scale, of simplification and falsification, of perspectivity. The most important thing, however, is: that we understand that the ruler and his subjects are of the same kind, all feeling, willing, thinking-and that, wherever we see or divine movement in a body, we learn to conclude that there is a subjective, invisible life appertaining to it. Movement is symbolism for the eye; it indicates that something has been felt, willed, thought.

The danger of the direct questioning of the subject *about* the subject and of all self-reflection of the spirit lies in this, that it could be useful and important for one's activity to interpret oneself *falsely.* That is why we question the body and reject the evidence of the sharpened senses: we try, if you like, to see whether the inferior parts themselves cannot enter into communication with us.

4. Biology of the Drive to Knowledge. Perspectivism

493 (1885)

Truth is the kind of error without which a certain species of life could not live. The value for *life* is ultimately decisive.

494 (1885)

It is improbable that our "knowledge" should extend further than is strictly necessary for the preservation of life. Morphology shows us how the senses and the nerves, as well as the brain, develop in proportion to the difficulty of finding nourishment.

495

If the morality of "thou shalt not lie" is rejected, the "sense for truth" will have to legitimize itself before another tribunal:-as a means of the preservation of man, as *will to power.*

Likewise our love of the beautiful: it also is our shaping will. The two senses stand side-by-side; the sense for the real is the means of acquiring the power to shape things according to our wish. The joy in shaping and reshaping-a primeval joy! We can comprehend only a world that we ourselves have made.

496 (1884)

Of the multifariousness of knowledge. To trace one's own relationship to many other things (or the relationship of kind)-how should that be "knowledge" of other things! The way of knowing and of knowledge is itself already part of the conditions of existence: so that the conclusion that there could be no other kind of intellect (for us) than that which preserves us is precipitate: this actual condition of existence is perhaps only accidental and perhaps in no way necessary.

Our apparatus for acquiring knowledge is not *designed* for "knowledge."

497 (1884)

The most strongly believed a priori "truths" are for me *provisional assumptions;* e.g., the law of causality, a very well acquired habit of belief, so much a part of us that not to believe in it would destroy the race. But are they for that reason truths? What a conclusion! As if the preservation of man were a proof of truth!

498 (1884)

To what extent even our intellect is a consequence of conditions of existence-: we would not have it if we did not *need* to have it, and we would not have it *as it is* if we did not need to have it *as it is,* if we could live *otherwise.*

499 (1885)

"Thinking" in primitive conditions (pre-organic) is the crystallization of forms, as in the case of crystal.-In *our* thought, the essential feature is fitting new material into old schemes (= Procrustes' bed), *making* equal what is new.

500 (1885-1886)

Sense perceptions projected "outside": "inside" and "outside"-does the *body* command here-?

The same equalizing and ordering force that rules in the idioplasma, rules also in the incorporation of the outer world: our sense perceptions are already the result of this assimiliation and equalization in regard to *all* the past in us; they do not follow directly upon the "impression"-

501 (1886-1887)

All thought, judgment, perception, considered as comparison, has as its precondition a *"positing* of equality," and earlier still a *"making* equal." The process of making equal is the same as the process of incorporation of appropriated material in the amoeba.

"Memory" late, in so far as here the drive to make equal seems already to have been subdued: differentiation is preserved. Remembering as a process of classification and pigeonholing: who is active?

502 (1885)

One must revise one's ideas about *memory:* here lies the chief temptation to assume a "soul," which, outside time, reproduces, recognizes, etc. But that which is experienced lives on "in the memory"; I cannot help it if it "comes back," the will is inactive in this case, as in the coming of any thought. Something happens of which I become conscious: now something similar comes-who called it? roused it?

503 (1884)

The entire apparatus of knowledge is an apparatus for abstraction and simplification-directed not at knowledge but at taking possession of things: "end" and "means" are as remote from its essential nature as are "concepts." With "end" and "means" one takes possession of the process (one invents a process that can be grasped); with "concepts," however, of the "things" that constitute the process.

504 (1883-1888)

Consciousness-beginning quite externally, as coordination and becoming conscious of "impressions"-at first at the furthest distance from the biological center of the individual; but a process that deepens and intensifies itself, and continually draws nearer to that center.

505 (1885-1886)

Our perceptions, as we understand them: i.e., the sum of all those perceptions the becoming-conscious of which was useful and essential to us and to the entire organic process-therefore not all perceptions in general (e. g., not the electric); this means: we have senses for only a selection of perceptions-those with which we have to concern ourselves in order to preserve ourselves. *Consciousness is present only to the extent that consciousness is useful.* It cannot be doubted that *all sense perceptions are permeated with value judgments* (useful and harmful-consequently, pleasant or unpleasant). Each individual color is also for us an expression of value (although we seldom admit it, or do so only after a protracted impression of exclusively the same color; e.g., a prisoner in prison, or a lunatic). Thus insects also react differently to different colors: some like [this color, some that]; e.g., ants.

506 (1884)

First *images*-to explain how images arise in the spirit. Then *words,* applied to images. Finally *concepts,* possible only when there are words-the collecting together of many images in something nonvisible but audible (word). The tiny amount of emotion to which the "word" gives rise, as we contemplate similar images for which *one* word exists-this weak emotion is the common element, the basis of the concept. That weak sensations are regarded as alike, sensed *as being the same,* is the fundamental fact. Thus confusion of two sensations that are close neighbors, as we take note of these sensations; but *who* is taking note? Believing is the primal beginning even in every sense impression: a kind of affirmation the first intellectual activity! A "holding-true" in the beginning! Therefore it is to be explained: how "holding-true" arose! What sensation lies *behind* "true"?

507 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The *valuation* "I believe that this and that is so" as the *essence* of *"truth."* In valuations are expressed conditions of preservation and growth. All our organs of knowledge and our senses are developed only with regard to conditions of preservation and growth. Trust in reason and its categories, in dialectic, therefore the valuation of logic, proves only their usefulness for life, proved by experience-*not* that something is true.

That a great deal of *belief* must be present; that judgments may be ventured; that doubt concerning all essential values is *lacking*-that is the precondition of every living thing and its life. Therefore, what is needed is that something must be held to be true-*not* that something *is* true.

"The *real* and the *apparent* world"-I have traced this antithesis back to *value* relations. We have projected the conditions of *our* preservation as predicates of being in general. Because we have to be stable in our beliefs if we are to prosper, we have made the "real" world a world not of change and becoming, but one of being.

5. Origin of Reason and Logic

508 (1883-1888)

Originally a chaos of ideas. The ideas that were consistent with one another remained, the greater number perished-and are perishing.

509 (1883-1888)

The earthly kingdom of desires out of which logic grew: the herd instinct in the background. The assumption of similar cases presupposes "similar souls." For the purpose of mutual agreement and dominion.

510 (1883-1888)

On the *origin of logic.* The fundamental inclination to posit as equal, to *see* things as equal, is modified, held in check, by consideration of usefulness and harmfulness, by considerations of success: it adapts itself to a milder degree in which it can be satisfied without at the same time denying and endangering life. This whole process corresponds exactly to that external, mechanical process (which is its symbol) by which protoplasm makes what it appropriates equal to itself and fits it into its own forms and files.

511 (1885-1886)

Equality and similarity.

1. The coarser organ sees much apparent equality;
2. the spirit *wants* equality, i.e., to subsume a sense impression into an existing series: in the same way as the body *assimilates* inorganic matter.

Toward an understanding of logic:

the will to equality is the will to power-the belief that something is thus and thus (the essence of *judgment*) is the consequence of a will that as much as possible *shall* be equal.

512 (1885)

Logic is bound to the condition: assume there are identical cases. In fact, to make possible logical thinking and inferences, this condition must first be treated fictitously as fulfilled. That is: the will to logical truth can be carried through only after a fundamental *falsification* of all events is assumed. From which it follows that a drive rules here that is capable of employing both means, firstly falsification, then the implementation of its own point of view: logic does *not* spring from will to truth.

513 (Fall 1886)

The inventive force that invented categories labored in the service of our needs, namely of our need for security, for quick understanding on the basis of signs and sounds, for means of abbreviation:-"substance," "subject," "object," "being," "becoming" have nothing to do with metaphysical truths.-

It is the powerful who made the names of things into law, and among the powerful it is the greatest artists in abstraction who created the categories.

514 (March-June 1888)

A morality, a mode of living tried and *proved* by long experience and testing, at length enters consciousness as a law, as *dominating*-And therewith the entire group of related values and states enters into it: it becomes venerable, unassailable, holy, true; it is part of its development that its origin should be forgotten-That is a sign it has become master-

Exactly the same thing could have happened with the categories of reason: they could have prevailed, after much groping and fumbling, through their relative utility-There came a point when one collected them together, raised them to consciousness as a whole-and when one commanded them, i.e., when they had the effect of a command- From then on, they counted as a priori, as beyond experience, as irrefutable. And yet perhaps they represent nothing more than the expediency of a certain race and species-their utility alone is their "truth"-

5l5 (March-June 1888)

Not "to know" but to schematize to impose upon chaos as much regularity and form as our practical needs require.

In the formation of reason, logic, the categories, it was *need* that was authoritative: the need, not to "know," but to subsume, to schematize, for the purpose of intelligibility and calculation-(The development of reason is adjustment, invention, with the aim of making similar, equal-the same process that every sense impression goes through!) No pre-existing "idea" was here at work, but the utilitarian fact that only when we see things coarsely and made equal do they become calculable and usable to us-Finality in reason is an effect, not a cause: life miscarries with any other kinds of reason, to which there is a continual impulse-it becomes difficult to survey-too unequal-

The categories are "truths"' only in the sense that they are conditions of life for us: as Euclidean space is a conditional "truth." (Between ourselves: since no one would maintain that there is any necessity for men to exist, reason, as well as Euclidean space, is a mere idiosyncracy of a certain species of animal, and one among many-)

The subjective compulsion not to contradict here is a biological compulsion: the instinct for the utility of inferring as we do infer is part of us, we almost *are* this instinct-But what naiveté to extract from this a proof that we are therewith in possession of a "truth in itself"!-Not being able to contradict is proof of an incapacity, not of "truth."

516 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

We are unable to affirm and to deny one and the same thing: this is a subjective empirical law, not the expression of any "necessity" but only of an inability.

If, according to Aristotle, the law of contradiction is the most certain of all principles, if it is the ultimate and most basic, upon which every demonstrative proof rests, if the principle of every axiom lies in it; then one should consider all the more rigorously what*presuppositions* already lie at the bottom of it. Either it asserts something about actuality, about being, as if one already knew this from another source; that is, as if opposite attributes could not be ascribed to it. Or the proposition means: opposite attributes *should* not be ascribed to it. In that case, logic would be an imperative, not to know the true, but to posit and arrange a world that shall be called true by us.

In short, the question remains open: are the axioms of logic adequate to reality or are they a means and measure for us to *create* reality, the concept "reality," for ourselves.?-To affirm the former one would, as already said, have to have a previous knowledge of being-which is certainly not the case. The proposition therefore contains no *criterion of truth,* but an *imperative* concerning that which *should* count as true.

Supposing there were no self-identical *"A",* such as is presupposed by every proposition of logic (and of mathematics), and the *"A"* were already mere appearance, then logic would have a merely apparent world as its condition. In fact, we believe in this proposition under the infiuence of ceaseless experience which seems continually to confirrn it. The "thing"-that is the real substratum of *"A";our belief in things* is the precondition of our belief in logic. The *"A"* of logic is, like the atom, a reconstruction of the thing-If we do not grasp this, but make of logic a criterion of true being, we are on the way to positing as realities all those hypostases: substance, attribute, object, subject, action, etc.; that is, to conceiving a metaphysical world, that is, a "real world" (-*this, however, is the apparent world once more*-).

The very first acts of thought, affirmation and denial, holding true and holding not true, are, in as much as they presuppose, not only the habit of holdings things true and holding them not true, but a right to do this, already dominated by the belief that we can gain possession of knowledge, that judgments really can hit upon the truth;- in short, logic does not doubt its ability to assert something about the true-in-itself (namely, that it *cannot* have opposite attributes).

Here reigns the coarse sensualistic prejudice that sensations teach us truths about things-that I cannot say at the same time of one and the same thing that it is hard and that it is soft. (The instinctive proof "I cannot have two opposite sensations at the same time"-quite coarse and false.)

The conceptual ban on contradiction proceeds from the belief that we are *able* to form concepts, that the concept not only designates the essence of a thing but *comprehends* it-In fact, logic (like geometry and arithmetic) applies only to fictitious entities that we have created. Logic is the attempt to comprehend the actual world by means of a scheme of being posited by ourselves; more correctly, to make it formulatable and calculable for us-

517 (Spring-Fall 1887)

In order to think and infer it is necessary to assume beings: logic handles only formulas for what remains the same. That is why this assumption would not be proof of reality: "beings" are part of our perspective. The "ego" as a being (-not affected by becoming and development).

The fictitious world of subject, substance, "reason," etc., is needed-: there is in us a power to order, simplify, falsify, artificially distinguish. "Truth" is the will to be master over the multiplicity of sensations:-to classify phenomena into definite categories. In this we start from a belief in the "in-itself" of things (we take phenomena as *real).*

The character of the world in a state of becoming as incapable of formulation, as "false," as "'self-contradictory." Knowledge and becoming exclude one another. Consequently, "knowledge" must be something else: there must first of all be a will to make knowable, a kind of becoming must itself create the deception of beings.

518 (1885-1886)

If our "ego" is for us the sole being, after the model of which we fashion and understand all being: very well! Then there would be very much room to doubt whether what we have here is not a perspective illusion-an apparent unity that encloses everything like a horizon. The evidence of the body reveals a tremendous multiplicity; it is allowable, for purposes of method, to employ the more easily studied, richer phenomena as evidence for the understanding of the poorer. Finally: supposing everything is becoming, then knowledge is possible only on the basis of belief in being.

519 (1883-1888)

If there "is only one being, the ego" and all other "being" is fashioned after its model-if, finally, belief in the "ego" stands or falls with belief in logic, i.e., the metaphysical truth of the categories of reason; if, on the other hand, the ego proves to be something in a state of becoming: then-

520 (1885)

Continual transition forbids us to speak of "individuals," etc; the "number" of beings is itself in flux. We would know nothing of time and motion if we did not, in a coarse fashion, believe we see what is at "rest" beside what is in motion. The same applies to cause and effect, and without the erroneous conception of "empty space" we should certainly not have acquired the conception of space. The principle of identity has behind it the "apparent fact" of things that are the same. A world in a state of becoming could not, in a strict sense, be "comprehended" or "known"; only to the extent that the "comprehending" and "knowing" intellect encounters a coarse, already-created world, fabricated out of mere appearances but become firm to the extent that this kind of appearance has preserved life-only to this extent is there anything like "knowledge"; i.e., a measuring of earlier and later errors by one another.

521 (Spring-Fall 1887)

On "logical semblance"-The concepts "individual" and "species" equally false and merely apparent. "Species" expresses only the fact that an abundance of similar creatures appear at the same time and that the tempo of their further growth and change is for a long time slowed down, so actual small continuations and increases are not very much noticed (-a phase of evolution in which the evolution is not visible, so an equilibrium *seems* to have been attained, making possible the false notion *that a goal has been attained*-and that evolution has a goal-).

The form counts as something enduring and therefore more valuable; but the form has merely been invented by us; and however often "the same form is attained," it does not mean that it is the same form-what appears is always something new, and it is only we, who are always comparing, who include the new, to the extent that it is similar to the old, in the unity of the "form." As if a*type* should be attained and, as it were, was intended by and inherent in the process of formation.

Form, species, law, idea, purpose-in all these cases the same error is made of giving a false reality to a fiction, as if events were in some way obedient to something-an artificial distinction is made in respect of events between that which acts and that toward which the act is directed (but this "which" and this "toward" are only posited in obedience to our metaphysical-logical dogmatism: they are not "facts").

One should not understand this compulsion to construct concepts, species, forms, purposes, laws ("a world of identical cases") as if they enabled us to fix the *real world;* but as a compulsion to arrange a world for ourselves in which our existence is made possible:-we thereby create a world which is calculable, simplified, comprehensible, etc., for us.

This same compulsion exists in the sense activities that support reason-by simplification, coarsening, emphasizing, and elaborating, upon which all "recognition," all ability to make oneself intelligible rests. Our needs have made our senses so precise that the "same apparent world" always reappears and has thus acquired the semblance of reality.

Our subjective compulsion to believe in logic only reveals that, long before logic itself entered our consciousness, we did nothing but introduce its postulates into events: now we discover them in events-we can no longer do otherwise-and imagine that this compulsion guarantees something connected with "truth." It is we who created the "thing," the "identical thing," subject, attribute, activity, object, substance, form, after we had long pursued the process of making identical, coarse and simple. The world seems logical to us because we have made it logical.

522 (1886-1887)

Ultimate solution.-We believe in reason: this, however, is the philosophy of gray *concepts.* Language depends on the most naive prejudices.

Now we read disharmonies and problems into things because we think only in the form of language-and thus believe in the "eternal truth" of "reason" (e.g., subject, attribute, etc.)

We cease to think when we refuse to do so under the constraint of language; we barely reach the doubt that sees this limitation as a limitation.

Rational thought is interpretation according to a scheme that we cannot throw off.

6. Consciousness

523 (March-June 1888)

Nothing is more erroneous than to make of psychical and physical phenomena the two faces, the two revelations of one and the same substance. Nothing is explained thereby: the concept "substance" is perfectly useless as an explanation. Consciousness in a subsidiary role, almost indifferent, superfluous, perhaps destined to vanish and give way to a perfect automatism-

When we observe only the inner phenomena we may be compared with the deaf-and-dumb, who divine through movements of the lips the words they do not hear. From the phenomena of the inner sense we conclude the existence of invisible and other phenomena that we would apprehend if our means of observation were adequate and that one calls the nerve current.

We lack any sensitive organs for this inner world, so we sense a thousandfold complexity as a unity; so we introduce causation where any reason for motion and change remains invisible to us-the sequence of thoughts and feelings is only their becoming visible in consciousness. That this sequence has anything to do with a causal chain is completely unbelievable: consciousness has never furnished us with an example of cause and effect.

524 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The role of "consciousness."-It is essential that one should not make a mistake over the role of "consciousness": it is our relation with the "outer world" that evolved it. On the other hand, the direction or protection and care in respect of the co-ordination of the bodily functions does *not* enter our consciousness; any more than spiritual accumulation: that a higher court rules over these things cannot be doubted-a kind of directing committee on which the various chief desires make their votes and power felt. "Pleasure," "displeasure" are hints from this sphere; also the act of will; also ideas.

In summa: That which becomes conscious is involved in causal relations which are entirely withheld from us-the sequence of thoughts, feelings, ideas in consciousness does not signify that this sequence is a causal sequence; but apparently it is so, to the highest degree. Upon this *appearance* we have founded our whole idea of spirit, reason, logic, etc. (-none of these exist: they are fictitious syntheses and unities), and projected these *into* things and *behind* things!

Usually, one takes consciousness itself as the general sensorium and supreme court; nonetheless, it is only a means of communication: it is evolved through social intercourse and with a view to the interests of social intercourse- "Intercourse" here understood to include the influences of the outer world and the reactions they compel on our side; also our effect upon the outer world. It is not the directing agent, but an organ of the directing agent.

525 (1888)

My proposition compressed into a formula that smells of antiquity, Christianity, scholasticism, and other muskiness: in the concept "God as *spirit,"* God as perfection is *negated*-

526 (March-June 1888)

Where a certain unity obtains in the grouping of things, one has always posited *spirit* as the cause of this coordination: for which notion there is no ground whatever. Why should the idea of a complex fact be one of the conditions of this fact? or why should the *notion* of a complex fact have to precede it as its cause?-

We shall be on our guard against explaining purposiveness in terms of spirit: there is no ground whatever for ascribing to spirit the properties of organization and systematization. The nervous system has a much more extensive domain; the world of consciousness is added to it. Consciousness plays no role in the total process of adaptation and systematization.

527 (1886-1887)

Physiologists, like philosophers, believe that consciousness increases in value in proportion as it increases in clarity: the clearest consciousness, the most logical and coldest thinking, is supposed to be of the *first* rank. However-by what measure is this value determined?- In regard to release of will, the most superficial, most simplified thinking is the most useful-it could therefore-etc. (because it leaves few motives over).

Precision in action is antagonistic to far-seeing providentiality, the judgments of which are often uncertain: the latter is led by the deeper instinct.

528 (1886-1887)

Principal error of psychologists: they regard the indistinct idea as a lower kind of idea than the distinct: but that which removes itself from our consciousness and for that reason becomes obscure*can* on that account be perfectly clear in itself. Becoming obscure is a matter of perspective of consciousness.

529 (March-June 1888)

Tremendous blunders:

1. the absurd overestimation of consciousness, the transformation of it into a unity, an entity: "spirit," "soul," something that feels, thinks, wills-
2. spirit as cause, especially wherever purposiveness, system, co-ordination appear;
3. consciousness as the highest achieveable form, as the supreme kind of being, as "God";
4. will introduced wherever there are effects;
5. the "real world" as a spiritual world, as accessible through the facts of consciousness;
6. knowledge as uniquely the faculty of consciousness wherever there is knowledge at all.

Consequences:

every advance lies in an advance in becoming conscious; every regression in becoming unconscious; (-becoming unconscious was considered a falling back to the desires and senses-as becoming animal-)

one approaches reality, "real being," through dialectic; one distances oneself from it through the instincts, senses, mechanism-

to resolve man into spirit would mean to make him into God: spirit, will, goodness-all one;

all good must proceed from spirituality, must be a fact of consciousness;

any advance toward the better can only be an advance in becoming conscious.

7. Judgment. True-False

530 (1883-1888)

In the case of Kant, theological prejudice, his unconscious dogmatism, his moralistic perspective, were dominant, directing, commanding.

The *proton pseudos* [First falsehood or original error.]: how is the fact of knowledge possible? is knowledge a fact at all? what is knowledge? If we do not know what knowledge is, we cannot possibly answer the question whether there is knowledge.-Very well! But if I do not "know' whether there is knowledge, whether there can be knowledge, I cannot reasonably put the question "what is knowledge?" Kant *believes* in the fact of knowledge: what he wants is a piece of naiveté: knowledge of knowledge!

"Knowledge is judgment!" But judgment is a belief that something is thus and thus! And *not* knowledge! "All knowledge consists of synthetic judgments" of *universal* validity (the case is thus and not otherwise in every case), of *necessary* validity (the opposite of the assertion can never occur).

The legitimacy of belief in knowledge is always presupposed: just as the legitimacy of the feelings of conscience-judgments is presupposed. Here moral ontology is the dominant prejudice.

The conclusion is therefore:

1. there are assertions that we consider universally valid and necessary;
2. necessity and universal validity cannot be derived from experience;
3. consequently they must be founded, not upon experience, but upon something else, and derive from another source of knowledge!

(Kant infers (1) there are assertions which are valid only under a certain condition; (2) this condition is that they derive, not from experience, but from pure reason.)

Therefore: the question is, whence do we derive our reasons for believing in the truth of such assertions? No, how our belief is caused! But the origin of a belief, of a strong conviction, is a psychological problem: and a *very* narrow and limited experience often produces such a belief! It already presupposes that there is not *"data a posteriori"* but also *data a priori,* "preceding experience." Necessity and universal validity could never be given to us by experience: why does that mean that they are present without any experience at all?

There are no isolated judgments!

An isolated judgment is never "true," never knowledge; only in the connection and relation of many judgments is there any surety.

What distinguishes the true from the false belief? What is knowledge? He "knows" it, that is heavenly!
Necessity and universality can never be given by experience! Thus they are independent of experience, prior to all experience! That insight that occurs a priori, therefore independently of all experience, out of sheer reason, is "a *pure* form of knowledge"!
"The basic laws of logic, the law of identity and the law of contradiction, are forms of pure knowledge, because they precede all experience."-But these are not forms of knowledge at all! they are regulative articles of belief.
To establish the a priori character (the pure rationality) of the judgments of mathematics, space must be conceived as a form of pure reason.
Hume had declared: "There are no synthetic a priori judgments." Kant says: But there are! Those of mathematics! And if there are such judgments, perhaps there is also metaphysics, a knowledge of things by pure reason!
Mathematics is possible under conditions under which metaphysics is *never* possible. All human knowlege is either experience or mathematics.
A judgment is synthetic; i.e., it connects different ideas.
It is a priori; i.e., every connection is a universally valid and necessary one, which can never be given by sense perception but only through pure reason.
If there are to be synthetic a priori judgments, then reason must be in a position to make connections: connection is a form. Reason must possess the capacity of giving form.

531 (1885-1886)

Judgment is our oldest belief, our most habitual holding-true or holding-untrue, an assertion or denial, a certainty that something is thus and not otherwise, a belief that here we really "know"-what is it that is believed true in all judgments?
What are attributes?-We have not regarded change in us as change but as an "in itself" that is foreign to us, that we merely "perceive": and we have posited it, not as an event, but as a being, as a "quality"-and in addition invented an entity to which it adheres; i.e., we have regarded the *effect* as something that *effects,* and this we have regarded as a being. But even in this formulation, the concept "effect" is arbitrary: for those changes that take place in us, and that we firmly believe we have not ourselves caused, we merely infer to be effects, in accordance with the conclusion: "every change must have an author";-but this conclusion is already mythology: it separates that which effects from the effecting. If I say "lightning flashes," I have posited the flash once as an activity and a second time as a subject, and thus added to the event a being that is not one with the event but is rather fixed, *is,* and does not "become."-To regard an event as an "effecting," and this as being, that is the double error, or interpretation, of which we are guilty.

532 (1885)

Judgment-this is the belief: "This and that are so." Thus there is in every judgment the avowal of having encountered an "identical case": it therefore presupposes comparison with the aid of memory. The judgment does not produce the appearance of an identical case. Rather it believes it perceives one: it works under the presupposition that identical cases exist. Now, what is that function that must be much older and must have been at work much earlier, that makes cases identical and similar which are in themselves dissimilar? What is that second function, which on the basis of the first, etc. "Whatever arouses the same sensation is the same": but what is it that makes sensations the same, "accepts" them as the same? There could be no judgments at all if a kind of equalization were not practiced within sensations: memory is possible only with a continual emphasizing of what is already familiar, experienced.- Before judgment occurs, the process of assimilation must already have taken place; thus here, too, there is an intellectual activity that does not enter consciousness, as pain does as a consequence of a wound. Probably an inner event corresponds to each organic function; hence assimilation, rejection, growth, etc.
Essential: to start from the *body* and employ it as guide. It is the much richer phenomenon, which allows of clearer observation. Belief in the body is better established than belief in the spirit.
"No matter how strongly a thing may be believed, strength of belief is no criterion of truth." But what is truth? Perhaps a kind of belief that has become a condition of life? In that case, to be sure, strength could be a criterion; e.g., in regard to causality.

533 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Logical certainty, transparency, as criterion of truth (*"omni illud verum est, quod clare et distincte percipitur."* [All that is true which is perceived clearly and distinctly.] Descartes): with that, the mechanical hypothesis concerning the world is desired and credible.
But this is a crude confusion: like *simplex sigillum veri* [Simplicity is the seal of truth.]. How does one know that the real nature of things stands in *this* relation to our intellect?- Could it not be otherwise? that it is the hypothesis that gives the intellect the greatest feeling of power and security, that is most preferred, valued and

consequently characterized as true?- The intellect posits its freest and strongest capacity and capability as criterion of the most valuable, consequently of the true-
"True": from the standpoint of feeling-: that which excites the feeling most strongly ("ego");
from the standpoint of thought-: that which gives thought the greatest feeling of strength;
from the standpoint of touch, seeing, hearing-: that which calls for the greatest resistance.
Thus it is the highest degrees of performance that awaken belief in the "truth," that is to say reality, of the object. The feeling of strength, of struggle, of resistance convinces us that there is something that is here being resisted.

534 (1887-1888)

The criterion of truth resides in the enhancement of the feeling of power.

535 (1885)

"Truth": this, according to my way of thinking, does not necessarily denote the antithesis of error, but in the most fundamental cases only the posture of various errors in relation to one another. Perhaps one is older, more profound than another, even ineradicable, in so far as an organic entity of our species could not live without it; while other errors do not tyrannize over us in this way as conditions of life, but on the contrary when compared with such "tyrants" can be set aside and "refuted."
An assumption that is irrefutable-why should it for that reason be "true"? This proposition may perhaps outrage logicians, who posit *their* limitations as the limitations of things: but I long ago declared war on this optimism of logicians.

536 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

Everything simple is merely imaginary, is not "true." But whatever is real, whatever is true, is neither one nor even reducible to one.

537 (1885-1888)

What is truth?-Inertia; that hypothesis which gives rise to contentment; smallest expenditure of spiritual force, etc.

538 (1883-1888)

First proposition. The easier mode of thought conquers the harder mode;-as dogma: *simplex sigillum veri.-Dico:* [I say.] to suppose that clarity proves anything about truth is perfect childishness-
Second proposition. The doctrine of being, of things, of all sorts of fixed unities is a hundred times easier than the doctrine of becoming, of development-
Third proposition. Logic was intended as facilitation; as a means of expression-not as truth- Later it acquired the effect of truth-

539 (March-June 1888)

Parmenides said, "one cannot think of what is not",-we are at the other extreme, and say "what can be thought of must certainly be a fiction."

540 (1885)

There are many kinds of eyes. Even the sphinx has eyes-and consequently there are many kinds of "truths," and consequently there is no truth.

541 (March-June 1888)

Inscriptions for the Door of a Modern Madhouse

"What is thought necessarily is morally necessary." Herbert Spencer.
"The ultimate test of the truth of a proposition is the conceivability of its negation." Herbert Spencer. [Quotations translated from Nietzsche's German.]

542 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

If the character of existence should be false-which would be possible-what would truth, all our truth, be then?- An unconscionable falsification of the false? The false raised to a higher power?-

543 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

In a world that is essentially false, truthfulness would be an antinatural tendency: such a tendency could have meaning only as a means to a higher power of falsehood. In order for a world of the true, of being, to be invented, the truthful man would first have to be created (including the fact that such a man believes himself "truthful").
Simple, transparent, not in contradiction with himself, durable, remaining always the same, without wrinkle, volt, concealment, form: a man of this kind conceives a world of being as "God" in his own image.
For truthfulness to be possible, the whole sphere of man must be very clean, small and, respectable; advantage in every sense must be with the truthful man.- Lies, deception, dissimulation must arouse astonishment-

544 (1885-1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

Increase in "dissimulation" proportionate to the rising order of rank of creatures. It seems to be lacking in the inorganic world- power against power, quite crudely-cunning begins in the organic world; plants are already masters of it. The highest human beings, such as Caesar, Napoleon (Stendhal's remark on him) [Nietzsche copied a passage from Stendhal's *Vie de Napoléon* ("Life of Napoleon," Preface, p. *xv*) into another noterbook: *Une croyance presque instinctive chez moi c'est que tout homme puissant ment quand il parle et á plus forte raison quand il écrit"* (An almost instinctive faith with me that every powerful man lies when he speaks and the more when he writes).], also the higher races (Italians), the Greeks (Odysseus); a thousandfold craftiness belongs to the essence of the enhancement of man-problem of the actor. My Dionysus ideal- The perspective of all organic functions, all the strongest instincts of life: the force in all life that *wills* error; error as the precondition even of thought. Before there is "thought" there must have been "invention"; the *construction* of identical cases, of the appearance of sameness, is more primitive than the *knowledge* of sameness.

8. Against Causalism

545 (1885)

I believe in absolute space as the substratum of force: the latter limits and forms. Time eternal. But space and time do not exist in themselves. "Changes" are only appearances (or sense processes for us); if we posit the recurrence of these, however regular, nothing is established thereby except this simple fact, that it has always happened thus. The feeling that *post hoc* is *propter hoc* can easily be shown to be a misunderstanding; it is comprehensible. But appearances cannot be "causes"!

546 (1885-1886)

The interpretation of an event as either an act or the suffering of an act (-thus every act a suffering) says: every change, every becoming-other, presupposes an author and someone upon who "change" is effected.

547 (1885-1886)

Psychological history of the concept "subject." The body, the thing, the "whole" construed by the eye, awaken the distinction between a deed and a doer; the doer, the cause of the deed, conceived ever more subtly, finally left behind the "subject."

548 (1885-1886)

Our bad habit of taking a mnemonic, an abbreviative formula, to be an entity, finally as a cause, e.g., to say of lightning "it flashes." Or the little word "I." To make a kind of perspective in seeing the cause of seeing: that was what happened in the invention of the "subject," the "I"!

549 (1885)

"Subject," "object," "attribute"-these distinctions are fabricated and are now imposed as a schematism upon all the apparent facts. The fundamental false observation is that I believe it is *I* who do something, suffer something, "have" something, "have" a quality.

550 (1885-1886)

In every judgment there resides the entire, full, profound belief in subject and attribute, or in cause and effect (that is, as the assertion that every effect is an activity and that every activity presupposes an agent); and this latter belief is only a special case of the former, so there remains as the fundamental belief the belief that there are subjects, that everything that happens is related attributively to some subject.

I notice something and seek a reason for it; this means originally: I seek an intention in it, and above all someone who has intentions, a subject, a doer: every event a deed-formerly one saw intentions in all events, this is our oldest habit. Do animals also possess it? As living beings, must they not also rely on interpretations based on *themselves?*-

The question "why?" is always a question after the *causa finalis*[Final cause or purpose.], after the "what for?" We have no "sense for the *causa efficiens* [Efficient cause.]": here Hume was right; habit (but not only that of the individual!) makes us expect that a certain often-observed occurrence will follow another: nothing more! That which gives the extraordinary firmness to our belief in causality is not the great habit of seeing one occurrence following another but our inability to interpret events otherwise than as events caused by intentions. It is belief in the living and thinking as the only effective force-in will, in intention-it is belief that every event is a deed, that every deed presupposes a doer, it is belief in the "subject." Is this belief in the concept of subject and attribute not a great stupidity?

Question: is intention the cause of an event? Or is that also illusion?

Is it not the event itself?

551 (March-June 1888)

Critique of the concept "cause."- We have absolutely no experience of a cause; psychologically considered, we derive the entire concept from the subjective conviction that we are causes, namely, that the arm moves- But that is an error. We separate ourselves, the doers, from the deed, and we make use of this pattern everywhere- we seek a doer for every event. What is it we have done? We have misunderstood the feeling of strength,

tension, resistance, a muscular feeling that is already the beginning of the act, as the cause, or we have taken the will to do this or that for a cause because the action follows upon it-cause, i.e.,--

There is no such thing as "cause"; some cases in which it seemed to be given us, and in which we have projected it out of ourselves in order to understand an event, have been shown to be self-deceptions. Our "understanding of an event" has consisted in our inventing a subject which was made responsible for something that happens and for how it happens. We have combined our feeling of will, our feeling of "freedom," our feeling of responsibility and our intention to perform an act, into the concept "cause": *causa efficiens* and *causa finalis* are fundamentally one.

We believed that an effect was explained when a condition was detected in which the effect was already inherent. In fact, we invent all causes after the schema of the effect: the latter is known to us- Conversely, we are not in a position to predict of any thing what it will "effect." The thing, the subject, will, intention-all inherent in the conception "cause." We search for things in order to explain why something has changed. Even the atom is this kind of super-added "thing" and "primitive subject"-

At length we grasp that things-consequently atoms, too-effect nothing: because they do not exist at all-that the concept of causality is completely useless.- A necessary sequence of states does not imply a causal relationship between them (-that would mean making their effective capacity leap from 1 to 2, to 3, to 4, to 5). There are neither causes nor effects. Linguistically we do not know how to rid ourselves of them. But that does not matter. If I think of the muscle apart from its "effects," I negate it-

In summa: an event is neither effected nor does it effect. *Causa* is a capacity to produce effects that has been super-added to the events-

Interpretation by causality a deception- A "thing" is the sum of its effects, synthetically united by a concept, an image. In fact, science has emptied the concept causality of its content and retained it as a formula of an equation, in which it has become at bottom a matter of indifference on which side cause is placed and on which side effect. It is asserted that in two complex states (constellations of force) the quanta of force remain constant.

The *calculability of an event* does not reside in the fact that a rule is adhered to, or that a necessity is obeyed, or that a law of causality has been projected by us into every event: it resides in the *recurrence of "identical cases."*

There is no such thing as a sense of causality, as Kant thinks. One is surprised, one is disturbed, one desires something familiar to hold on to- As soon as we are shown something old in the new, we are calmed. The supposed instinct for causality is only fear of the unfamiliar and the attempt to discover something familiar in it-a search, not for causes, but for the familiar.

552 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Against determinism and teleology. -From the fact that something ensues regularly and ensues calculably, it does not follow that it ensues *necessarily.* That a quantum of force determines and conducts itself in every particular case in one way and manner does not make it into an "unfree will." "Mechanical necessity" is not a fact: it is we who first interpreted it into events. We have interpreted the formulatable character of events as the consequence of a necessity that rules over events. But from the fact that I do a certain thing, it by no means follows that I am compelled to do it. Compulsion in things certainly cannot be demonstrated: the rule proves only that one and the same event is not another event as well. Only because we have introduced subjects, "doers," into things does it appear that all events are the consequences of compulsion exerted upon subjects-exerted by whom? again by a "doer." Cause and effect-a dangerous concept so long as one thinks of something that causes and something upon which an effect is produced.

a. Necessity is not a fact but an interpretation.

*

b. When one has grasped that the "subject" is not something that creates effects, but only a fiction, much follows.

It is only after the model of the subject that we have invented the reality of things and projected them into the medley of sensations. If we no longer believe in the effective subject, then belief also disappears in effective things, in reciprocation, cause and effect between those phenomena that we call things.

There also disappears, of course, the world of effective atoms: the assumption of which always depended on the supposition that one needed subjects.

At last, the "thing-in-itself" also disappears, because this is fundamentally the conception of a "subject-in-itself." But we have grasped that the subject is a fiction. The antithesis "thing-in-itself" and "appearance" is untenable; with that, however, the concept "appearance" also disappears.

*

c. If we give up the effective subject, we also give up the object upon which effects are produced. Duration, identity with itself, being are inherent neither in that which is called subject nor in that which is called object: they are complexes of events apparently durable in comparison with other complexes-e.g., through the difference in

tempo of the event (rest-motion, firm-loose: opposites that do not exist in themselves and that actually express only variations in degree that from a certain perspective appear to be opposites. There are no opposites: only from those of logic do we derive the concept of opposites-and falsely transfer it to things).
d. If we give up the concept "subject" and "object," then also the concept "substance"-and as a consequence also the various modifications of it, e.g., "matter," "spirit," and other hypothetical entities, "the eternity and immutability of matter," etc. We have got rid of *materiality.*

*

From the standpoint of morality, the world is false. But to the extent that morality itself is a part of this world, morality is false.
Will to truth is a making firm, a making true and durable, an abolition of the false character of things, a reinterpretation of it into beings. "Truth" is therefore not something there, that might be found or discovered-but something that must be created and that gives a name to a process, or rather to a will to overcome that has in itself no end-introducing truth, as a *processus in infinitum,* an active determining-not a becoming conscious of something that is in itself firm and determined. It is a word for the "will to power."
Life is founded upon the premise of a belief in enduring and regularly recurring things; the more powerful life is, the wider must be the knowable world to which we, as it were, attribute being. Logicizing, rationalizing, systematizing as expedients of life.
Man projects his drive to truth, his "goal" in a certain sense' outside himself as a world that has being, as a metaphysical world, as a "thing-in-itself," as a world already in existence. His needs as creator invent the world upon which he works, anticipate it; this anticipation (this "belief" in truth) is his support.

*

All events, all motion, all becoming, as a determination, degrees and relations of force, as a *struggle*-

*

As soon as we imagine someone who is responsible for our being thus and thus, etc. (God, nature), and therefore attribute to him the intention that we should exist and be happy or wretched, we corrupt for ourselves the *innocence of becoming.* We then have someone who wants to achieve something through us and with us.

*

The "'welfare of the individual" is just as imaginary as the "welfare of the species": the former is *not* sacrificed to the latter, species viewed from a distance is just as transient as the individual. "Preservation of the species" is only a consequence of the growth of the species, i.e., the. overcoming of the species on the road to a stronger type.

*

[Theses.-] That the apparent "purposiveness" ("that purposiveness which endlessly surpasses all the arts of man") is merely the consequence of the will to power manifest in all events; that becoming stronger involves an ordering process which looks like a sketchy purposiveness; that apparent ends are not intentional but, as soon as dominion is established over a lesser power and the latter operates as a function of the greater power, an order of rank, of organization is bound to produce the appearance of an order of means and ends.
Against apparent *"necessity":*
-this is only an expression for the fact that a force is not also something else.
Against apparent *"purposiveness":*
-the latter only an expression for an order of spheres of power and their interplay.

9. Thing-in-Itself and Appearance

553 (1886-1887)

The sore spot of Kant's critical philosophy has gradually become visible even to dull eyes: Kant no longer has a right to his distinction "appearance" and "thing-in-itself"-he had deprived himself of the right to go on distinguishing in this old familiar way, in so far as he rejected as impermissible making inferences from phenomena to a cause of phenomena-in accordance with his conception of causality and its purely intra-phenomenal validity-which conception, on the other hand, already anticipates this distinction, as if the "thing-in-itself" were not only inferred but *given.*

554 (1885-1886)

Causalism.-It is obvious that things-in-themselves cannot be related to one another as cause and effect, nor can appearance be so related to appearance; from which it follows that in a philosophy that believes in things-in-themselves and appearances the concept "cause and effect" *cannot be applied.* Kant's mistakes--
In fact, the concept "cause and effect" derives, psychologically speaking, only from a mode of thought that believes that always and everywhere will operates upon will-that believes only in living things and fundamentally only in *"souls"* (and *not* in things). Within the mechanistic view of the world (which is logic and its application to

space and time), that concept is reduced to the formulas of mathematics-with which, as one must emphasize again and again, nothing is ever comprehended, but rather designated and distorted.

555 (1885-1886)

Against the scientific prejudice.- The biggest fable of all is the fable of knowledge. One would like to know what things-in-themselves are; but behold, there are no things-in-themselves! But even supposing there were an in-itself, an unconditioned thing, it would for that very reason be unknowable! Something unconditioned cannot be known; otherwise it would not be unconditioned! Coming to know, however, is always "placing oneself in a conditional relation to something"--one who seeks to know the unconditioned desires that it should not concern him, and that this same something should be of no concern to anyone. This involves a contradiction, first, between *wanting* to know and the desire that it not concern us (but why know at all, then?) and, secondly, because something that is of no concern to anyone *is* not at all, and thus cannot be known at all.-

Coming to know means "to place oneself in a conditional relation to something"; to feel oneself conditioned by something and oneself to condition it-it is therefore under all circumstances establishing, denoting, and making-conscious of conditions (not forthcoming entities, things, what is "in-itself").

556 (1885-1886)

A "thing-in-itself" just as perverse as a "sense-in-itself," a "meaning-in-itself." There are no "facts-in-themselves," for a sense must always be projected into them before there can be "facts."

The question "what is that?" is an imposition of meaning from some other viewpoint. "Essence," the "essential nature," is something perspective and already presupposes a multiplicity. At the bottom of it there always lies "what is that for *me?"* (for us, for all that lives, etc.)

A thing would be defined once all creatures had asked "what is that?" and had answered their question. Supposing one single creature, with its own relationships and perspectives for all things, were missing, then the thing would not yet be "defined."

In short: the essence of a thing is only an *opinion* about the "thing." Or rather: "it is considered" is the real "it is," the sole "this is."

One may not ask: "who then interprets?" for the interpretation itself is a form of the will to power, exists (but not as a "being,' but as a process, a becoming) as an affect.

The origin of "things" is wholly the work of that which imagines, thinks, wills, feels. The concept "thing" itself just as much as all its qualities.- Even "the subject" is such a created entity, a "thing" like all others: a simplification with the object of defining the force which posits, invents, thinks, as distinct from all individual positing, inventing, thinking as such. Thus a capacity as distinct from all that is individual-fundamentally, action collectively considered with respect to all anticipated actions (action and the probability of similar actions).

557 (1885-1886)

The properties of a thing are effects on other "things":
if one removes other "things," then a thing has no properties,
i.e., there is no thing without other things,
i.e., there is no "thing-in-itself."

558 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The "thing-in-itself" nonsensical. If I remove all the relationships, all the "properties," all the "activities" of a thing, the thing does not remain over; because thingness has only been invented by us owing to the requirements of logic, thus with the aim of defining, communication (to bind together the multiplicity of relationships, properties, activities).

559 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

"Things that have a constitution in themselves"-a dogmatic idea with which one must break absolutely.

560 (Spring-Fall 1887)

That things possess a constitution in themselves quite apart from interpretation and subjectivity, is a quite idle hypothesis: it presupposes that interpretation and subjectivity are not essential, that a thing freed from all relationships would still be a thing.

Conversely, the apparent *objective* character of things: could it not be merely a difference of degree within the subjective?-that perhaps that which changes slowly presents itself to us as "objectively" enduring, being, "in-itself"-that the objective is only a false concept of a genus and an antithesis *within* the subjective?

561 (1885-1886)

Suppose all unity were unity only as an organization? But the "thing" in which we believe was only invented as a foundation for the various attributes. If the thing "effects," that means: we conceive all the other properties which are present and momentarily latent, as the cause of the emergence of one single property; i.e., we take the sum of its properties-*"x"*-as cause of the property *"x"*: which is utterly stupid and mad!

All unity is unity only as organization and co-operation-just as a human community is a unity-as opposed to an atomistic anarchy, as a pattern of domination that *signifies* a unity but *is* not a unity.

562 (1883-1888)

"In the development of thought a point had to be reached at which one realized that what one called the properties of things were sensations of the feeling subject: at this point the properties ceased to belong to the thing." The "thing-in-itself" remained. The distinction between the thing-in-itself and the thing-for-us is based on the older, naive form of perception which granted energy to things; but analysis revealed that even force was only projected into them, and likewise-substance. "The thing affects a subject"? Root of the idea of substance in language, not in beings outside us! The thing-in-itself is no problem at all!

Beings will have to be thought of as sensations that are no longer based on something devoid of sensation.

In motion, no new *content* is given to sensation. That which is, cannot contain motion: therefore it is a *form* of being.

N.B. The explanation of an event can be sought firstly: through mental images of the event that precede it (aims);

secondly: through mental images that succeed it (the mathematical-physical explanation).

One should not confuse the two. Thus: the physical explanation, which is a symbolization of the world by means of sensation and thought, can in itself never account for the origin of sensation and thought; rather physics must construe the world of feeling consistently as lacking feeling and aim-right up to the highest human being. And teleology is only a history of purposes and never physical!

563 (1886-1887)

Our "knowing" limits itself to establishing quantities; but we cannot help feeling these differences in quantity as qualities. Quality is a perspective truth for *us;* not an "in-itself."

Our senses have a definite quantum as a mean within which they function; i.e., we sense bigness and smallness in relation to the conditions of our existence. If we sharpened or blunted our senses tenfold, we should perish; i.e., with regard to making possible our existence we sense even relations between magnitudes as qualities.

564 (1885-1886)

Might all quantities not be signs of qualities? A greater power implies a different consciousness, feeling, desiring, a different perspective; growth itself is a desire to be more; the desire for an increase in quantum grows from a *quale* [How constitued? or of what quality?]; in a purely quantitative world everything would be dead, stiff, motionless.- The reduction of all qualities to quantities is nonsense: what appears is that the one accompanies the other, an analogy-

565 (Fall 1886)

Qualities are insurmountable barriers for us; we cannot help feeling that mere quantitative differences are something fundamentally distinct from quantity, namely that they are *qualities* which can no longer be reduced to one another. But everything for which the word "knowledge" makes any sense refers to the domain of reckoning, weighing, measuring, to the domain of quantity; while, on the other hand, all our sensations of value (i.e., sirnply our sensations) adhere precisely to qualities, i.e., to our perspective "truths" which belong to us alone and can by no means be "known"! It is obvious that every creature different from us senses different qualities and consequently lives in a different world from that in which we live. Qualities are an idiosyncrasy peculiar to man; to demand that our human interpretations and values should be universal and perhaps constitutive values is one of the hereditary madnesses of human pride.

566 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The "real world," however one has hitherto conceived it-it has always been the apparent world *once again.*

567 (March-June 1888)

The apparent world, i.e., a world viewed according to values; ordered, selected according to values, i.e., in this case according to the viewpoint of utility in regard to the preservation and enhancement of the power of a certain species of animal.

The perspective therefore decides the character of the "appearance"! As if a world would still remain over after one deducted the perspective! By doing that one would deduct relativity!

Every center of force adopts a perspective toward the entire remainder, i.e., its own particular valuation, mode of action, and mode of resistance. The "apparent world," therefore, is reduced to a specific mode of action on the world, emanating from a center.

Now there is no other mode of action whatever; and the "world" is only a word for the totality of these actions. Reality consists precisely in this particular action and reaction of every individual part toward the whole-

No shadow of a right remains to speak here of *appearance*-

The specific mode of reacting is the only mode of reacting; we do not know how many and what kinds of other modes there are.

But there is no "other," no "true," no essential being-for this would be the expression of a world *without* action and reaction-
The antithesis of the apparent world and the true world is reduced to the antithesis "world" and "nothing."-

568 (March-June 1888)

Critique of the concept "true and apparent world." -Of these, the first is a mere fiction, constructed of fictitious entities.
"Appearance" itself belongs to reality: it is a form of its being; i.e., in a world where there is no being, a certain calculable world of identical cases must first be created through appearance: a tempo at which observation and comparison are possible, etc.
Appearance is an arranged and simplified world, at which our practical instincts have been at work; it is perfectly true for *us;* that is to say, we live, we are able to live in it: proof of its truth for us-
the world, apart from our condition of living in it, the world that we have not reduced to our being, our logic and psychological prejudices, does not exist as a world "in-itself"; it is essentially a world of relationships; under certain conditions it has a differing aspect from every point; its being is essentially different from every point; it presses upon every point, every point resists it-and the sum of these is in every case quite incongruent.
The measure of power determines what being possesses the other measure of power; in what form, force, constraint it acts or resists.
Our particular case is interesting enough: we have produced a conception in order to be able to live in a world, in order to perceive just enough to endure it-

569 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Our psychological perspective is determined by the following:

1. that communication is necessary, and that for there to be communication something has to be firm, simplified, capable of precision (above all in the [so-called] *identical* case). For it to be communicable, however, it must be experienced as adapted, as "recognizable." The material of the senses adapted by the understanding, reduced to rough outlines, made similar, subsumed under related matters. Thus the fuzziness and chaos of sense impressions are, as it were, logicized;
2. the world of "phenomena" is the adapted world which we feel to be real. The "reality" lies in the continual recurrence of identical, familiar, related things in their logicized character, in the belief that here we are able to reckon and calculate;
3. the antithesis of this phenomenal world is not "the true world," but the formless unformulable world of the chaos of sensations-*another kind* of phenomenal world, a kind "unknowable" for us;
4. questions, what things "in-themselves" may be like, apart from our sense receptivity and the activity of our understanding, must be rebutted with the question: how could we know that things exist? "Thingness" was first created by us. The question is whether there could not be many other ways of creating such an apparent world-and whether this creating, logicizing, adapting, falsifying is not itself the best-guaranteed reality; in short, whether that which "posits things" is not the sole reality; and whether the "effect of the external world upon us" is not also only the result of such active subjects- The other "entities" act upon us; our adapted apparent world is an adaptation and overpowering of their actions; a kind of defensive measure. The subject alone is demonstrable; hypothesis that only subjects exist-that "object" is only a kind of effect produced by a subject upon a subject a *modus* of *the subject.*

10. Metaphysical Need

570 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

If one is a philosopher as men have always been philosophers, one cannot see what has been and becomes-one sees only what *is.* But since nothing *is,* all that was left to the philosopher as his "world" was the imaginary.

571 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

To assert the existence as a whole of things of which we know nothing whatever, precisely because there is an advantage in not being able to know anything of them, was a piece of naiveté of Kant, resulting from needs, mainly moral-metaphysical.

572 (1883-1888)

An artist cannot endure reality, he looks away from it, back: he seriously believes that the value of a thing resides in that shadowy residue one derives from colors, form, sound, ideas; he believes that the more subtilized, attenuated, transient a thing or a man is, the more valuable he becomes; the less real, the more valuable. This is Platonism, which, however, involved yet another bold reversal: Plato measured the degree of reality by the degree of value and said: The more "Idea," the more being. He reversed the concept "reality" and said: "What you take for real is an error, and the nearer we approach the 'Idea,' the nearer we approach 'truth.' "-
Is this understood? It was the greatest of rebaptisms; and because it has been adopted by Christianity we do not

recognize how astonishing it is. Fundamentally, Plato, as the artist he was, preferred appearance to being! lie and invention to truth! the unreal to the actual! But he was so convinced of the value of appearance that he gave it the attributes "being," "causality" and "goodness," and "truth," in short everything men value.
The concept of value itself considered as a cause: first insight.
The ideal granted all honorific attributes: second insight.

573 (Jan.-Fall 1888)

The idea of the "true world" or of "God" as absolutely immaterial, spiritual, good, is an emergency measure necessary while the opposite instincts are still all-powerful-
The degree of moderation and humanity attained is exactly reflected in the humanization of the gods: the Greeks of the strongest epoch, who were not afraid of themselves but rejoiced in themselves, brought their gods close to all their own affects-.
The spiritualization of the idea of God is therefore far from being a sign of *progress:* one is heartily conscious of this when considering Goethe-in his case, the vaporization of God into virtue and spirit is felt as being on a *coarser* level-

574 (1883-1888)

Senselessness of all metaphysics as the derivation of the conditioned from the unconditioned.
It is in the nature of thinking that it thinks of and invents the unconditioned as an adjunct to the conditioned; just as it thought of and invented the "ego" as an adjunct to the multiplicity of its processes; it measures the world according to magnitudes posited by itself-such fundamental fictions as "the unconditional," "ends and means," "things," "substances," logical laws, numbers and forms.
There would be nothing that could be called knowledge if thought did not first re-form the world in this way into "things," into what is self-identical. Only because there is thought is there untruth.
Thought cannot be derived, any more than sensations can be; but that does not mean that its primordiality or "being-in-itself" has been proved! all that is established is that we cannot get beyond it, because we *have* nothing but thought and sensation.

575 (1885-1886)

"Knowledge" is a referring back: in its essence a *regressus in infinitum.* That which comes to a standstill (at a supposed *causa prima,* at something unconditioned, etc.) is laziness, weariness--

576 (1883-1888)

Psychology of metaphysics: the influence of timidity.
That which has been feared the most, the cause of the most powerful suffering (lust to rule, sex, etc.), has been treated by men with the greatest amount of hostility and eliminated from the "true" world. Thus they have eliminated the affects one by one-posited God as the antithesis of evil, that is, placed reality in the negation of the desires and affects (i.e., in *nothingness)*.
In the same way, they have hated the irrational, the arbitrary, the accidental (as the causes of immeasurable physical suffering). As a consequence, they negated this element in being-in-itself and conceived it as absolute "rationality" and "purposiveness."
In the same way, they have feared change, transitoriness: this expresses a straitened soul, full of mistrust and evil experiences (the case of Spinoza: an opposite kind of man would account change a stimulus).
A creature overloaded and *playing* with force would call precisely the affects, irrationality, and change good in a eudaemonistic sense, together with their consequences: danger, contrast, perishing, etc.

577 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Against the value of that which remains eternally the same (*vide* Spinoza's naiveté; Descartes' also), the values of the briefest and most transient, the seductive flash of gold on the belly of the serpent *vita* [Life.]-

578 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Moral values even in theory of knowledge:
trust in reason-why not mistrust?
the "true world" is supposed to be the good world-why?
appearance, change, contradiction, struggle devalued as immoral; desire for a world in which these things are missing;
the transcendental world invented, in order that a place remains for "moral freedom" (in Kant);
dialectic a way to virtue (in Plato and Socrates: evidently because Sophistry counted as the way to immorality);
time and space ideal: consequently "unity" in the essence of things; consequently no "sin," no evil, no imperfection-a justification of God;
Epicurus denied the possibility of knowledge, in order to retain moral (or hedonistic) values as the highest values. Augustine, later Pascal ("corrupted reason"), did the same for the benefit of Christian values;
Descartes' contempt for everything that changes; also that of Spinoza.

579 (1883-1888)

Psychology of metaphysics. -This world is apparent: consequently there is a true world;-this world is conditional: consequently there is an unconditioned world;-this world is full of contradiction: consequently there is a world free of contradiction;- this world is a world of becoming: consequently there is a world of being:-all false conclusions (blind trust in reason: if *A* exists, then the opposite concept *B* must also exist). It is suffering that inspires these conclusions: fundamentally they are *desires* that such a world should exist; in the same way, to imagine another, more valuable world is an expression of hatred for a world that makes one suffer: the *ressentiment* of metaphysicians against actuality is here creative.

Second series of questions: *for what* is there suffering?-and from this a conclusion is derived concerning the relation of the true world to our apparent, changing, suffering, contradictory world: (1) Suffering as a consequence of error: how is error possible? (2) Suffering as a consequence of guilt: how is guilt possible? (-experiences derived from nature or society universalized and projected to the sphere of "in-itself"). If, however, the conditioned world is causally conditioned by the unconditioned world, then freedom to err and incur guilt must also be conditioned by it: and again one asks, *what for?*- The world of appearance, becoming, contradiction, suffering, is therefore *willed: what for?*

The error in these conclusions: two opposite concepts are constructed-because one of them corresponds to a reality, the other "must" also correspond to a reality. "Whence should one derive this opposite concept if this were not so?"- Reason is thus a source of revelation concerning being-in-itself.

But the origin of these antitheses need not necessarily go back to a supernatural source of reason: it is sufficient to oppose to it the real genesis of the concepts. This derives from the practical sphere, the sphere of utility; hence the strength of the faith it inspires (one would perish if one did not reason according to this mode of reason; but this is no "proof" of what it asserts).

The preoccupation with suffering on the part of metaphysicians-is quite naive. "Eternal bliss": psychological nonsense. Brave and creative men *never* consider pleasure and pain as ultimate values-they are epiphenomena: one must *desire* both if one is to achieve anything-. That they see the problem of pleasure and pain in the foreground reveals something weary and sick in metaphysicians and religious people. Even morality is so important to them only because they see in it an essential condition for the abolition of suffering.

In the same way, their preoccupation with appearance and error: cause of suffering, superstition that happiness attends truth (confusion: happiness in "certainty," in "faith").

580 (Spring-Fall 1887)

To what extent the basic epistemological positions (materialism, idealism) are consequences of evaluations: the source of the supreme feelings of pleasure ("feelings of value") as decisive also for the problem of reality!

-The measure of positive knowledge is quite subsidiary or a matter of indifference: as witness the development of India.

The Buddhistic negation of reality in general (appearance = suffering) is perfectly consistent: undemonstrability, inaccessibility, lack of categories not only for a "'world-in-itself," but an insight into the erroneous procedures by means of which this whole concept is arrived at. "Absolute reality," "being-in-itself" a contradiction. In a world of becoming, "reality" is always only a simplification for practical ends, or a deception through the coarseness of organs, or a variation in the tempo of becoming.

Logical world-denial and nihilation [*Nihilisierung.*]follow from the fact that we have to oppose non-being with being and that the concept "becoming" is denied. *("Something"* becomes.)

581 (Spring-Fall 1887)

Being and becoming. -"Reason," evolved on a sensualistic basis, on the prejudices of the senses, i.e., in the belief in the truth of the judgments of the senses.

"Being" as universalization of the concept "life" (breathing), "having a soul," "willing, effecting," "becoming."

The antithesis is: "not to have a soul," "not to become," "not to will." Therefore: "being" is *not* the antithesis of non-being, appearance, nor even of the dead (for only something that can live can be dead).

The "soul," the "ego" posited as primeval fact, and introduced everywhere where there is any becoming.

582 (1885-1887)

Being-we have no idea of it apart from the idea of "living."- How can anything dead "be"?

583 (March-June 1888)

(A)

I observe with astonishment that science has today resigned itself to the apparent world; a real world-whatever it may be like-we certainly have no organ for knowing it.

At this point we may ask: by means of what organ of knowledge can we posit even this antithesis?-

That a world accessible to our organs is also understood to be dependent upon these organs, that we understand a world as being subjectively conditioned, is not to say that an objective world is at all possible. Who compels us to think that subjectivity is real, essential?
The "in-itself" is even an absurd conception; a "constitution-in-itself" is nonsense; we possess the concept "being," "thing," only as a relational concept-
The worst thing is that with the old antithesis "apparent" and "true" the correlative value judgment "lacking in value" and "absolutely valuable" has developed.
The apparent world is not counted as a "valuable" world; appearance is supposed to constitute an objection to supreme value. Only a "true" world can be valuable in itself-
Prejudice of prejudices! Firstly, it would be possible that the true constitution of things was so hostile to the presuppositions of life, so opposed to them, that we needed appearance in order to be able to live- After all, this is the case in so many situations; e.g., in marriage.
Our empirical world would be determined by the instincts of self-preservation even as regards the limits of its knowledge: we would regard as true, good, valuable that which serves the preservation of the species-
a. We possess no categories by which we can distinguish a true from an apparent world. (There might only be an apparent world, but not *our* apparent world.)
b. Assuming the *true* world, it could still be a world less valuable for us; precisely the quantum of illusion might be of a higher rank on account of its value for our preservation. (Unless appearance as such were grounds for condemnation?)
c. That a correlation exists between degrees of value and degrees of reality (so that the supreme values also possess the supreme reality) is a metaphysical postulate proceeding from the presupposition that we *know* the order of rank of values; namely, that this order of rank is a *moral* order- Only with this presupposition is truth necessarily part of the definition of all the highest values.

(B)

It is of cardinal importance that one should abolish the *true* world. It is the great inspirer of doubt and devaluator in respect of the world *we are:* it has been our most dangerous attempt yet to assassinate life.
War on all presuppositions on the basis of which one has invented a true world. Among these is the presupposition that moral values are the supreme values.
The supremacy of moral valuation would be refuted if it could be shown to be the consequence of an immoral valuation-as a special case of actual immorality-it would thus reduce itself to an appearance, and as appearance it would cease to have any right as such to condemn appearance.

(C)

The "will to truth" would then have to be investigated psychologically: it is not a moral force, but a form of the will to power. This would have to be proved by showing that it employs every *immoral*means: metaphysicians above all-.
We are today faced with testing the assertion that moral values are the supreme values. Method in investigation is attained only when all moral prejudices have been overcome:-it represents a victory over morality-

584 (March-June 1888)

The aberration of philosophy is that, instead of seing in logic and the categories of reason means toward the adjustment of the world for utilitarian ends (basically, toward an expedient *falsification)*, one believed one possessed in them the criterion of truth and *reality.* The "criterion of truth" was in fact merely the biological utility of such a system of systematic falsification; and since a species of animals knows of nothing more important than its own preservation, one might indeed be permitted to speak here of "truth." The naiveté was to take an anthropocentric idiosyncrasy as the *measure of things,* as the rule for determining "real" and "unreal": in short, to make absolute something conditioned. And behold, suddenly the world fell apart into a "true" world and an "apparent" world: and precisely the world that man's reason had devised for him to live and settle in was discredited. Instead of employing the forms as a tool for making the world manageable and calculable, the madness ["Madness": very doubtful conjecture; in the original, two illegible words.] of philosophers divined that in these categories is presented the concept of that world to which the one in which man lives does not correspond- The means were misunderstood as measures of value, even as a condemnation of their real intention-
The intention was to deceive oneself in a useful way; the means, the invention of formulas and signs by means of which one could reduce the confusing multiplicity to a purposive and manageable schema.
But alas! now a moral category was brought into play: no creature wants to deceive itself, no creature may deceive-consequently there is only a will to truth. What is "truth"?
The law of contradiction provided the schema: the true world, to which one seeks the way, cannot contradict itself, cannot change, cannot become, has no beginning and no end.

This is the greatest error that has ever been committed, the essential fatality of error on earth: one believed one possessed a criterion of reality in the forms of reason-while in fact one possessed them in order to become master of reality, in order to misunderstand reality in a shrewd manner-
And behold: now the world became false, and precisely on account of the properties that constitute its reality: change, becoming, multiplicity, opposition, contradiction, war. And then the entire fatality was there:
1. How can one get free from the false, merely apparent world? (-it was the real, the only one);
2. how can one become oneself as much as possible the antithesis of the character of the apparent world? (Concept of the perfect creature as an antithesis to the real creature; more clearly, as the contradiction of life-)
The whole tendency of values was toward slander of life; one created a confusion of idealist dogmatism and knowledge in general: so that the opposing party also was always attacking *science.*
The road to science was in this way doubly blocked: once by belief in the "true" world, and again by the opponents of this belief. Natural science, psychology was (1) condemned with regard to its objects, (2) deprived of its innocence-
In the actual world, in which everything is bound to and conditioned by everything else, to condemn and think away anything means to condemn and think away everything. The expression "that should not be," "that should not have been," is farcical- If one thinks out the consequences, one would ruin the source of life if one wanted to abolish whatever was in some respect harmful or destructive. Physiology teaches us better!
-We see how morality (a) poisons the entire conception of the world, (b) cuts off the road to knowledge, to science, (c) disintegrates and undermines all actual instincts (in that it teaches that their roots are immoral).
We see at work before us a dreadful tool of decadence that props itself up by the holiest names and attitudes.

585 (Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

Tremendous self-examination: becoming conscious of oneself, not as individuals but as mankind. Let us reflect, let us think back; let us follow the highways and byways!

(A)

Man seeks "the truth": a world that is not self-contradictory, not deceptive, does not change, a *true* world-a world in which one does not suffer; contradiction, deception, change-causes of suffering! He does not doubt that a world as it ought to be exists; he would like to seek out the road to it. (Indian critique: evep the "ego" as apparent, as not real.)
Whence does man here derive the concept *reality?*-Why is it that he derives *suffering* from change, deception, contradiction? and why not rather his happiness?-
Contempt, hatred for all that perishes, changes, varies-whence comes this valuation of that which remains constant? Obviously, the will to truth is here merely the desire for a world of the constant.
The senses deceive, reason corrects the errors; consequently, one concluded, reason is the road to the constant; the least sensual ideas must be closest to the "true world."-It is from the senses that most misfortunes come-they are deceivers, deluders, destroyers.-
Happiness can be guaranteed only by being; change and happiness exclude one another. The highest desire therefore contemplates unity with what has being. This is the formula for: the road to the highest happiness.
In summa: the world as it ought to be exists; this world, in which we live, is an error-this world of ours ought not to exist.
Belief in what has being is only a consequence: the real *primum mobile* is disbelief in becoming, mistrust of becoming, the low valuation of all that becomes-
What kind of man reflects in this way? An unproductive, suffering kind, a kind weary of life. If we imagine the opposite kind of man, he would not need to believe in what has being; more, he would despise it as dead, tedious, indifferent-
The belief that the world as it ought to be is, really exists, is a belief of the unproductive who *do not desire to create a world* as it ought to be. They posit it as already available, they seek ways and means of reaching it. "Will to truth"-*as the impotence of the will to create.*
To know that something *is* thus and thus:

To act so that something *becomes* thus { Antagonism in the degree of power in different natures.

and thus:
The fiction of a world that corresponds to our desires: psychological trick and interpretation with the aim of associating everything we honor and find pleasant with this true world.
"Will to truth" at this stage is essentially an art of interpretation: which at least requires the power to interpret.

This same species of man, grown one stage poorer, no longer possessing the strength to interpret, to create fictions, produces *nihilists.* A nihilist is a man who judges of the world as it is that it ought *not* to be, and of the world as it ought to be that it does not exist. According to this view, our existence (action, suffering, willing, feeling) has no meaning: the pathos of "in vain" is the nihilists' pathos-at the same time, as pathos, an inconsistency on the part of the nihilists.
Whoever is incapable of laying his will into things, lacking will and strength, at least lays some *meaning* into them, i.e., the faith that there is a will in them already.
It is a measure of the degree of strength of will to what extent one can do without meaning in things, to what extent one can endure to live in a meaningless world *because one organizes a small portion of it oneself.*
The philosophical objective outlook can therefore be a sign that will and strength are small. For strength organizes what is close and closest; "men of knowledge," who desire only to ascertain what is, are those who cannot *fix* anything *as it ought to be.*
Artists, an intermediary species: they at least fix an image of that which ought to be; they are productive, to the extent that they actually alter and transform; unlike men of knowledge, who leave everything as it is.
Connection between philosophers and the pessimistic religions: the same species of man (-they ascribe the highest degree of reality to the most highly valued things-).
Connection between philosophers and moral men and their evaluations (-the moral interpretation of the world as meaning: after the decline of the religious meaning-).
Overcoming of philosophers through the destruction of the world of being: intermediary period of nihilism: before there is yet present the strength to reverse values and to deify becoming and the apparent world as the only world, and to call them good.

(B)

Nihilism as a normal phenomenon can be a symptom of increasing *strength* or of increasing *weakness:*
partly, because the strength to create, to will, has so increased that it no longer requires these total interpretations and introductions of meaning ("present tasks," the state, etc.);
partly because even the creative strength to create meaning has declined and disappointment becomes the dominant condition. The incapability of believing in a "meaning," "unbelief."
What does science mean in regard to both possibilities?
1. As a sign of strength and self-control, as being able to do without healing, comforting worlds of illusion;
2. as undermining, dissecting, disappointing, weakening.

(C)

Belief in truth, the need to have a hold on something believed true, psychological reduction apart from all previous value feelings. Fear, laziness.
The same way, *unbelief:* reduction. To what extent it acquires a new value if a true world does not exist (-thus the value feelings that hitherto have been squandered on the world of being, are again set free).

586 (March-June 1888)

The "True" *and the* "Apparent World"

(A)

The seductions that proceed from this concept are of three kinds:
a. an *unknown world:*-we are adventurers, inquisitive-that which is known seems to weary us (-the danger of this concept lies in its insinuation that "this" world is known to us-);
b. *another* world, where things are different; something in us calculates, our still submission, our silence, lose their value-perhaps everything will turn out well, we have not hoped in vain-the world where things are different, where we ourselves-who knows?-are different-
c. a *true* world: this is the most amazing trick and attack that has ever been perpetrated upon us; so much has become encrusted in the word "true," and involuntarily we make a present of all this to the "true world": the true world must also be a truthful world, one that does not deceive us, does not make fools of us: to believe in it is virtually to be compelled to believe in it (-out of decency, as is the case among people worthy of confidence-).

*

The concept "the unknown world" insinuates that *this* world is "known" to us (is tedious-);
the concept "another world" insinuates that the world could be otherwise-abolishes necessity and fate (useless to submit oneself-to adapt oneself-);
the concept "the true world" insinuates that this world is untruthful, deceptive, dishonest, inauthentic, inessential-and consequently also not a world adapted to our needs (-inadvisable to adapt oneself to it; better to resist it).

*

We therefore elude "this" world in three ways:
a. by our inquisitiveness-as if the more interesting part were elsewhere;

b. by our submission-as though it were not necessary to submit oneself-as if this world were not a necessity of the ultimate rank:
c. by our sympathy and respect-as if this world did not deserve them, were impure, were not honest with us-
In summa: we have revolted in three ways: we have made an *"x"* into a critique of the "known world."

(B)

First step toward *sobriety:* to grasp to what extent we have been seduced-for things could be exactly the reverse:
a. the *unknown* world could be a stupid and meaner form of existence-and "this" world might be rather enjoyable by comparison;
b. the *other* world, far from taking account of our desires which would find no fulfillment in it, could be among the mass of things that make *this* world possible for us: to get to know it might be a means of making us contented;
c. the true world: but who is it really who tells us that the apparent world must be of less value than the true one? Does our instinct not contradict this judgment? Does man not eternally create a fictitious world for himself because he wants a better world than reality? *Above all:* how do we arrive at the idea that our world is *not* the true world?-it could be that the other world is the "apparent" one (in fact the Greeks thought of, e.g., a *shadow kingdom,* an *apparent existence,* beside true existence). And finally: what gives us the right to posit, as it were, degrees of reality? This is something different from an unknown world-it is already a wanting to know something of the unknown-The "other," the "unknown" world-very good! But to say "true world" means "to *know* something of it"-That is the *opposite* of the assumption of an *"x"* world-
In summa: the world *"x"* could be in every sense more tedious, less human, and less worthy than this world.
It would be another thing to assert the existence of *"x"* worlds, i.e., of every possible world besides this one. But this has *never been asserted*-

(C)

Problem: why the notion of another world has always been unfavorable for, or critical of "this" world-what does this indicate.-
For a people proud of itself, whose life is ascending, always thinks of another kind of being as a lower, less valuable kind of being; it regards the strange, the unknown world as its enemy, as its opposite; it feels no inquisitiveness, it totally rejects the strange- A people would never admit that another people was the "true people."-
It is symptomatic that such a distinction should be at all possible-that one takes this world for the "apparent" one and the other world as "true."
The places of origin of the notion of "another world":
the philosopher, who invents a world of reason, where reason and the logical functions are adequate: this is the origin of the "true" world;
the religious man, who invents a "divine world": this is the origin of the "denaturalized, anti-natural" world;
the moral man, who invents a "free world": this is the origin of the "good, perfect, just, holy" world.
What the three places of origin have in common: the psychological blunder, the physiological confusions.
By what attributes is the "other world," as it actually appears in history, distinguished? By the stigmata of philosophical, religious, moral prejudice.
The "other world," as illumined by these facts, as a synonym for nonbeing, nonliving, not wanting to live-
General insight: it is the instinct of life-weariness, and not that of life, which has created the "other world."
Consequence: philosophy, religion, and morality are *symptoms of decadence.*

11. Biological Value of Knowledge

587 (1885-1886)

It might seem as though I had evaded the question of "certainty." The opposite is true; but by inquiring after the criterion of certainty I tested the scales upon which men have weighed in general hitherto-and that the question of certainty itself is a dependent question, a question of the second rank.

588 (1883-1886)

The question of values is more *fundamental* than the question of certainty: the latter becomes serious only by presupposing that the value question has already been answered.
Being and appearance, psychologically considered, yield no "being-in-itself" no criterion of "reality," but only for grades of appearance measured by the strength of the *interest* we show in an appearance.
There is no struggle for existence between ideas and perceptions, but a struggle for dominion: the idea that is overcome is not annihilated, only driven back or subordinated. There is no annihilation in the sphere of spirit-

589 (1885-1886)

"Ends and means"as interpretations (not as facts)"Cause and effect"and to what extent perhaps *nec*-"Subject and object" } *essary* interpretations? (as re-"Acting and suffering"quired for "preservation")-all"Thing-in-itself and appearance"in the sense of a will to power.**590 (1885-1886)**

Our values are interpreted *into* things.Is there then any *meaning* in the in-itself? !Is meaning not necessarily relative meaning and perspective?All meaning is will to power (all relative meaning resolves itself into it).**591 (1885)**

The desire for "solid facts" epistemology: how much pessimism there is in it!

592 (1883-1888)

The antagonism between the "true world," as revealed by pessimism, and a world possible for life-here one must test the rights of truth. It is necessary to measure the meaning of all these "ideal drives" against *life* to grasp what this antagonism really is: the struggle of sickly, despairing life that cleaves to a beyond, with healthier, more stupid and mendacious, richer, less degenerate life. Therefore it is not "truth" in struggle with life but *one* kind of life in struggle with another.-But it wants to be the higher kind!- Here one must demonstrate the need for an order of rank-that the first problem is the *order of rank of different kinds of life.*

593 (1885-1886)

To transform the belief "it is thus and thus" into the will *"it shall become thus and thus."*

12. Science

594 (1883-1888)

Science-this has been hitherto a way of putting an end to the complete confusion in which things exist, by hypotheses that "explain" everything-so it has come from the intellect's dislike of chaos.-This same dislike seizes me when I consider myself: I should like to form an image of the inner world, too, by means of some schema, and thus triumph over intellectual confusion. Morality has been a simplification of this kind: it taught that men were known, familiar.-Now we have destroyed morality-we have again become completely obscure to ourselves! I know that I know nothing of myself. Physics proves to be a boon for the heart: science (as the way to knowledge) acquires a new charm after morality has been eliminated-and because it is here alone that we find consistency, we have to construct our life so as to preserve it. This yields a sort of practical reflection on the conditions of our existence as men of knowledge.

595 (1884)

Our presuppositions: no God: no purpose: finite force. Let us guard against thinking out and prescribing the mode of thought necessary to lesser men! !

596 (1886-1887)

No "moral education" of the human race: but an enforced schooling in [scientific] errors is needed, because "truth" disgusts and makes one sick of life-unless man is already irrevocably launched upon his path and has taken his honest insight upon himself with a tragic pride.

597 (1886-1887)

The presupposition of scientific work: belief in the unity and perpetuity of scientific work, so the individual may work at any part, however small, confident that his work will not be in vain.

There is one great paralysis: to work *in vain,* to struggle in vain.--

*

The accumulative epochs, in which force and means of power are discovered that the future will one day make use of; science an intermediary station, at which the more intermediary, more multifarious, more complicated natures find their most natural discharge and satisfaction-all those who should avoid *action.*

598 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

A philosopher recuperates differently and with different means: he recuperates, e.g., with nihilism. Belief that there is no truth at all, the nihilistic belief, is a great relaxation for one who, as a warrior of knowledge, is ceaselessly fighting ugly truths. For truth is ugly. [Another version , written a few months later: "For a warrior of knowledge, who is always fighting ugly truths, the belief *that there is no truth at all* is a great bath and relaxation.-Nihilism is our kind of leisure."]

599 (1885-1886)

The "meaninglessness of events": belief in this is the consequence of an insight into the falsity of previous interpretations, a generalization of discouragement and weakness-not a *necessary* belief.

The immodesty of man: to deny meaning where he sees none.

600 (1885-1886)

No limit to the ways in which the world can be interpreted; every interpretation a symptom of growth or of decline.
Inertia needs unity (monism); plurality of interpretations a sign of strength. Not to desire to deprive the world of its disturbing and enigmatic character!

601 (1885-1886)

Against peaceableness and the desire for reconciliation. The attempt at monism belongs here.

602 (1884)

This perspective world, this world for the eye, tongue, and ear, is very false, even if compared for a very much more subtle sense-apparatus. But its intelligibility, comprehensibility, practicability, and beauty begin to cease if we refine our senses; just as beauty ceases when we think about historical processes; the order of purpose is already an illusion. It suffices that the more superficially and coarsely it is conceived, the more valuable, definite, beautiful, and significant the world appears. The deeper one looks, the more our valuations disappear-meaninglessness approaches! We have *created* the world that possesses values! Knowing this, we know, too, that reverence for truth is already the consequence of an illusion-and that one should value more than truth the force that forms, simpllfies, shapes, invents.
"Everything is false! Everything is permitted!"
Only with a certain obtuseness of vision, a will to simplicity, does the beautiful, the "valuable" appear: in itself, it is I know not what.

603 (1885)

That the destruction of an illusion does not produce truth but only one more piece of ignorance, an extension of our "empty space," an increase of our "desert"-

604 (1885-1886)

"Interpretation," the introduction of meaning not "explanation" (in most cases a new interpretation over an old interpretation that has become incomprehensible, that is now itself only a sign). There are no facts, everything is in flux, incomprehensible, elusive; what is relatively most enduring is-our opinions.

605 (Spring-Fall 1887)

The ascertaining of "truth" and "untruth," the ascertaining of facts in general, is fundamentally different from creative positing, from forming, shaping, overcoming, willing, such as is of the essence of philosophy. To introduce a meaning-this task still remains to be done, assuming there is no meaning yet. Thus it is with sounds, but also with the fate of peoples: they are capable of the most different interpretations and direction toward different goals.
On a yet higher level is to *posit a goal* and mold facts according to it; that is, active interpretation and not merely conceptual translation.

606 (1885-1886)

Ultimately, man finds in things nothing but what he himself has imported into them: the finding is called science, the importing -art, religion, love, pride. Even if this should be a piece of childishness, one should carry on with both and be well disposed toward both-some should find; others-*we* others!-should import!

607 (Spring-Fall 1886)

Science: its two sides:
in regard to the individual;
in regard to the cultural complex (level);
-valuations from one side or the other are mutually antagonistic.

608 (1886-1887)

The development of science resolves the "familiar" more and more into the unfamiliar:-it desires, however, the reverse, and proceeds from the instinct to trace the unfamiliar back to the familiar.
In summa, science is preparing a sovereign ignorance, a feeling that there is no such thing as "knowing," that it was a kind of arrogance to dream of it, more, that we no longer have the least notion that warrants our considering "knowledge" even a possibility-that "knowing" itself is a contradictory idea. We translate a primeval mythology and vanity of mankind into the hard fact: "knowledge-in-itself" is as impermissible a concept as is "thing-in-itself." Seduction by "number and logic," seduction by "laws."
"Wisdom" as the attempt to get beyond perspective valuations (i.e., beyond the "will to power"): a principle hostile to life and decadent, a symptom as among the Indians, etc., of the weakening of the power of appropriation.

609 (1884)

It is not enough that you understand in what ignorance man and beast live; you must also have and acquire the *will* to ignorance. You need to grasp that without this kind of ignorance life itself would be impossible, that it is a

condition under which alone the living thing can preserve itself and prosper: a great, firm dome of ignorance must encompass you.

610 (1884)

Science-the transformation of nature into concepts for the purpose of mastering nature-belongs under the rubric "means."

But the purpose and will of man must grow in the same way, the intention in regard to the whole.

611 (1883-1888)

We find that the strongest and most constantly employed faculty at all stages of life is thought-even in every act of perceiving and apparent passivity! Evidently, it thus becomes most powerful and demanding, and in the long run it tyrannizes over all other forces. Finally it becomes "passion-in-itself."

612 (Spring-Fall 1887)

To win back for the man of knowledge the right to great affects! after self-effacement and the cult of "objectivity" have created a false order of rank in this sphere, too. Error reached its peak when Schopenhauer taught: the only way to the "true," to knowledge, lies precisely in getting free from affects, from will; the intellect liberated from will cannot but see the true, real essence of things.

The same error *in arte* [In art.]: as if everything were beautiful as soon as it is viewed without will.

613 (Fall 1888)

Competition between affects and the dominion of one of the affects over the intellect.

614 (1884)

To "humanize" the world, i.e., to feel ourselves more and more masters within it-

615 (1884)

Among a higher kind of creatures, knowledge, too, will acquire new forms that are not yet needed.

616 (1885-1886)

That the value of the world lies in our interpretation (-that other interpretations than merely human ones are perhaps somewhere possible-); that previous interpretations have been perspective valuations by virtue of which we can survive in life, i.e., in the will to power, for the growth of power; that every elevation of man brings with it the overcoming of narrower interpretations; that every strengthening and increase of power opens up new perspectives and means believing in new horizons-this idea permeates my writings. The world with which we are concerned is false, i.e., is not a fact but a fable and approximation on the basis of a meager sum of observations; it is "in flux," as something in a state of becoming, as a falsehood always changing but never getting near the truth: for-there is no "truth."

617 (1883-1885)

To impose upon becoming the character of being-that is the supreme will to power.

Twofold falsification, on the part of the senses and of the spirit, to preserve a world of that which is, which abides, which is equivalent, etc.

That *everything recurs* is the closest *approximation of a world of becoming to a world of being:*-high point of the meditation.

From the values attributed to being proceed the condemnation of and discontent with becoming, after such a world of being had first been invented.

The metamorphoses of what has being (body, God, ideas, laws of nature, formulas, etc.)

"Beings" as appearance; reversal of values; appearance was that which conferred value-.

Knowledge-in-itself in a world of becoming is impossible; so how is knowledge possible? As error concerning oneself, as will to power, as will to deception.

Becoming as invention, willing, self-denial, overcoming of oneself: no subject but an action, a positing, creative, no "causes and effects."

Art as the will to overcome becoming, as "eternalization," but shortsighted, depending on the perspective: repeating in miniature, as it were, the tendency of the whole.

Regarding that which all life reveals as a diminutive formula for the total tendency; hence a new definition of the concept "life" as will to power.

Instead of "cause and effect" the mutual struggle of that which becomes, often with the absorption of one's opponent; the number of becoming elements not constant.

Uselessness of old ideals for the interpretation of the totality of events, once one knows the animal origin and utility of these ideals; all, moreover, contradictory to life.

Uselessness of the mechanistic theory-it gives the impression of meaninglessness.

The entire idealism of mankind hitherto is on the point of changing suddenly into nihilism-into the belief in absolute worthlessness, i.e.,*meaning*lessness.

The destruction of ideals, the new desert; new arts by means of which we can endure it, we amphibians.

Presupposition: bravery, patience, no "turning back," no haste to go forward. (N.B. Zarathustra adopts a parodistic attitude toward all former values as a consequence of his abundance.)

BOOK III (Cont'd.)
PRINCIPLES OF A NEW VALUATION
II. The Will to Power in Nature
1. The Mechanistic Interpretation of the World
2. The Will to Power as Life
A. The Organic Process
B. Man
3. Theory of the Will to Power and of Values
III. The Will to Power as Society and Individual
1. Society and State
2. The Individual
IV. The Will to Power as Art

Continue to Book IV <http://www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/wtp4od.htm> Return to INDEX <http://www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/wtp.htm>

SELECTED TEXT
BOOK III (Cont'd.)
PRINCIPLES OF A NEW VALUATION

II. The Will to Power in Nature

1. The Mechanistic Interpretation of the World

618
(1885)

Of all the interpretations of the world attempted hitherto, the mechanistic one seems today to stand victorious in the foreground. It evidently has a good conscience on its side; an no science believes it can achieve progress and success except with the aid of mechanistic procedures. Everyone knows these procedures: one leaves "reason" and "purpose" out of account as far as possible, one shows that, given sufficient time, anything can evolve out of anything else, and one does not conceal a malicious chuckle when "apparent intention" in the fate of a plant or an egg yolk is once again traced back to pressure and stress: in short, one pays heartfelt homage to the principle of the greatest possible stupidity, if a playful expression may be allowed concerning such serious matters. Meanwhile, a presentiment, or anxiety, is to be noted among select spirits involved in this movement, as if the theory had a hole in it that might sooner or later prove to be its final hole: I mean the shrill one through which one whistles in an extreme emergency. One cannot "explain" pressure and stress themselves, one cannot get free of the *actio in distans* [Action at a distance.]-one has lost the belief in being able to explain at all, and admits with a wry expression that description and not explanation is all that is possible, that the dynamic interpretation of the world, with its denial of "empty space" and its little clumps of atoms, will shortly come to dominate physicists; through an inner quality in *dynamis* [Power.]--

619
(1885)

The victorious concept "force," by means of which our physicists have created God and the world, still needs to be completed: an inner will must be ascribed to it, which I designate as "will to power," i.e., as an insatiable desire to manifest power; or as the employment and exercise of power, as a creative drive, etc. Physicists cannot eradicate "action at a distance" from their principles; nor can they eradicate a repellent force (or an attracting one). There is nothing for it: one is obliged to understand all motion, all "appearances," all "laws," only as symptoms of an inner event and to employ man as an analogy to this end. In the case of an animal, it is possible to trace all its drives to the will to power; likewise all the functions of organic life to this one source.

620
(1885-1886)

Has a *force* ever been demonstrated? No, only *effects* translated into a completely foreign language. We are so used, however, to regularity in succession that its oddity no longer seems odd to us.

621

(1885-1886)

A force we cannot imagine is an empty word and should be allowed no rights of citizenship in science; like the so-called purely mechanistic forces of attraction and repulsion, which are intended to make it possible for us to form an image of the world, no more!

622

(1885-1886)

Pressure and stress, something unspeakably late, derivative, un-primeval. For they presuppose something that holds together and is *able* to exert pressure and stress! But how can it hold together?

623

(March-June 1888)

There is nothing unchanging in chemistry: this is only appearance, a mere school prejudice. We have *slipped* in the unchanging, my physicist friends, deriving it from metaphysics as always. To assert that diamond, graphite, and carbon are identical is to read off the facts naively from the surface. Why? Merely because no loss in substance can be shown on the scales! Very well, they have something in common; but the activity of molecules during the transformation, which we cannot see or weigh, turns one material into something different-with specifically different properties.

624

(1883-1888)

Against the physical *atom.*- To comprehend the world, we have to be able to calculate it; to be able to calculate it, we have to have constant causes; because we find no such constant causes in actuality, we invent them for ourselves-the atoms. This is the origin of atomism.

The calculability of the world, the expressibility of all events in formulas-is this really "comprehension"? How much of a piece of music has been understood when that in it which is calculable and can be reduced to formulas have been reckoned up?- And "constant causes," things, substances, something "unconditioned"; *invented*-what has one achieved?

625

(March-June 1888)

The mechanistic conception of "motion" is already a translation of the original process into the sign language of sight and touch.

The concept "atom," the distinction between the "seat of a driving force and the force itself," is a sign language derived from our logical-psychical world.

We cannot change our means of expression at will: it is possible to understand to what extent they are mere signs. The demand for an adequate mode of expression is senseless: it is of the essence of a language, a means of expression, to express a mere relationship-

The concept "truth" is nonsensical. The entire domain of "true-false" applies only to relations, not to an "in-itself"- There is no "essence-in-itself" (it is only relations that constitute an essence-), just as there can be no "knowledge-in-itself."

626

(1883-1886)

"The sensation of force cannot proceed from motion: sensation in general cannot proceed from motion."

"It is only an apparent experience that speaks in favor of this: in a substance (brain), sensations are produced by transmitted motion (stimuli). But produced? Would this prove that the sensation did not exist there at all? so that its appearance would have to be conceived as a creative act on the part of the motion? The sensationless state of this substance is only a hypothesis! it is not experienced!- Sensation is thus a *property* of substance: there are substances that have sensations."

"Do we discover from certain substances that they have *no* sensations? No, we only fail to discover *that* they have any. It is impossible to derive sensation from a substance without sensation"- Oh what overhastiness!

627

(1885-1886)

"Attraction" and "repulsion" in a purely mechanistic sense are complete fictions: a word. We cannot think of an attraction divorced from an *intention.*- The will to take possession of a thing or to defend oneself against it and repel it-that, we "understand": that would be an interpretation of which we could make use.

In short: the psychological necessity for a belief in causality lies in the inconceivability of an event divorced from intent; by which naturally nothing is said concerning truth or untruth (the justification of such a belief)! The belief in *causae* [Efficient causes.] fails with the belief in téle [Final cause; purposes.] (against Spinoza and his causalism).

628

(1885-1886)

It is an illusion that something is *known* when we possess a mathematical formula for an event: it is only designated, described; nothing more!

629

(1883-1888)

If I reduce a regular event to a formula, I have foreshortened, facilitated, etc., the description of the whole phenomenon. But I have established no "law," I have raised the question how it happens that something here repeats itself: that the formula corresponds to a complex of initially unknown forces and discharges of force, is a supposition; it is mythology to think that forces here obey a law, so that, as a consequence of their obedience, we have the same phenomenon each time.

630

(1885)

I beware of speaking of chemical "laws": that savors of morality. It is far rather a question of the absolute establishment of power relationships: the stronger becomes master of the weaker, in so far as the latter cannot assert its degree of independence-here there is no mercy, no forbearance, even less a respect for "laws"!

631

(1885-1886)

The unalterable sequence of certain phenomena demonstrates no "law" but a power relationship between two or more forces. To say "But this relationship itself remains constant" is to say no more than "One and the same force cannot also be another force." - It is a question, not of succession, but of interpenetration, a process in which the individual successive moments are not related to one another as cause and effect-

The separation of the "deed" from the "doer," of the event from someone who produces events, of the process from a something that is not process but enduring, substance, thing, body, soul, etc.-the attempt to comprehend an event as a sort of shifting and place-changing on the part of a "being," of something constant: this ancient mythology established the belief in "cause and effect" after it had found a firm form in the functions of language and grammar.

632

(1885-1886)

"Regularity" in succession is only a metaphorical expression, *as if* a rule were being followed here; not a fact. In the same way "conformity with a law." We discover a formula by which to express an ever-recurring kind of result: we have therewith discovered no "law," even less a force that is the cause of the recurrence of a succession of results. That something always happens thus and thus is here interpreted as if a creature always acted thus and thus as a result of obedience to a law or a lawgiver, while it would be free to act otherwise were it not for the "law." But precisely this thus-and-not-otherwise might be inherent in the creature, which might behave thus and thus, not in response to a law, but because it is constituted thus and thus. All it would mean is: something cannot also be something else, cannot do now this and now something else, is neither free nor unfree but simply thus and thus. *The mistake lies in the fictitious insertion of a subject.*

633

(March-June 1888)

Two successive states, the one "cause," the other "effect": this is false. The first has nothing to effect, the second has been effected by nothing.

It is a question of a struggle between two elements of unequal power: a new arrangement of forces is achieved according to the measure of power of each of them. The condition is something fundamentally different from the first (not its effect): the essential thing is that the factions in struggle emerge with different quanta of power.

634

(March-June 1888)

Critique of the mechanistic theory.- Let us here dismiss the two popular concepts "necessity" and "law": the former introduces a false constraint into the world, the latter a false freedom. "things" do not behave

regularly, according to a *rule:* there are no things (-they are fictions invented by us); they behave just as little under the constraint of necessity. There is no obedience here: for that something is as it is, as strong or as weak, is not the consequence of an obedience or a rule or a compulsion-
The degree of resistance and the degree of superior power-this is the question in every event: if, for our day-to-day calculations, we know how to express this in formulas and "laws," so much the better for us! But we have not introduced any "morality" into the world by the fiction that it is obedient-.
There is no law: every power draws its ultimate consequence at every moment. Calculability exists precisely because things are unable to be other than they are.
A quantum of power is designated by the effect it produces and that which it resists. The adiaphorous state is missing, though it is thinkable. It is essentially a will to violate and to defend oneself against violation. Not self-preservation: every atom affects the whole of being-it is thought away if one thinks away this radiation of power-will. That is why I call it a quantum of "will to power": it expresses the characteristic that cannot be thought out of the mechanistic order without thinking away this order itself.
A translation of this world of effect into a visible world-a world for the eyes-is the conception "motion." This always carries the idea that *something* is moved-this always supposes, whether as the fiction of a little clump of atom or even as the abstraction of this, they dynamic atom, a thing that produces effects-i.e., we have not got away from the habit into which our senses and language seduce us. Subject, object, a doer added to the doing, the doing separated from that which it does: let us not forget that this is mere semeiotics and nothing real. Mechanistic theory as a theory of motion is already a translation into the sense language of man.

635
(March-June 1888)

We need "unities" in order to be able to reckon: that does not mean we must suppose that such unities exist. We have borrowed the concept of unity from our "ego" concept-our oldest article of faith. If we did not hold ourselves to be unities, we would never have formed the concept "thing." Now, somewhat late, we are firmly convinced that our conception of the ego does not guarantee any actual unity. In order to sustain the theory of a mechanistic world, therefore, we always have to stipulate to what extent we are employing two fictions: the concept of *motion* (taken from our sense language) and the concept of the *atom* (= unity, deriving from our psychical "experience"): the mechanistic theory presupposes a sense prejudice and a psychological prejudice.
Mechanistic theory formulates consecutive appearances, and it does so semeiotically, in terms of the senses and of psychology (that all effect is motion; that where there is motion *something* is moved); it does not touch upon the casual force.
The mechanistic world is imagined as only sight and touch imagine a world (as "moved")-so as to be calculable-thus causal unities are invented, "things" (atoms) whose effect remains constant (-transference of the false concept of subject to the concept of the atom).
The following are therefore phenomenal: the injection of the concept of number, the concept of the thing (concept of the subject), the concept of activity (separation of cause from effect), the concept of motion (sight and taste): our eye and our psychology are still part of it.
If we eliminate these additions, no things remain but only dynamic quanta, in a relation of tension to all other dynamic quanta: their essence lies in their relation to all other quanta, in their "effect" upon the same. The will to power not a being, not a becoming, but a *pathos* [Several Greek meanings: occasion, event, passion, suffering, and destiny.]-the most elemental fact from which a becoming and effecting first emerge-

636
(March-June 1888)

Physicists believe in a "true world" in their own fashion: a firm systematization of atoms in necessary motion, the same for all beings-so for them the "apparent world" is reduced to the side of universal and universally necessary being which is accessible to every being in its own way (accessible and also already adapted-mad "subjective"). But they are in error. The atom they posit is inferred according to the logic of the perspectivism of consciousness-and is therefore itself a subjective fiction. This world picture that they sketch differs in no essential way from the subjective world picture: it is only construed with more extended senses, but with *our* senses nonetheless- And in any case they left something out of the constellation without knowing it: precisely this necessary perspectivism by virtue of which every center of force-and not only man-construes all the rest of the world from its own viewpoint, i.e., measures, feels, forms, according to its own force- They forgot to include this perspective-setting force in "true

being"-in school language: the subject. They think this is "evolved," added later; but even the chemist needs it: it is being specific, definitely acting and reacting thus and thus, as may be the case.
Perspectivism is only a complex form of specificity. My idea is that every specific body strives to become master over all space and to extend its force (-its will to power:) and to thrust back all that resists its extension. But it continually encounters similar efforts on the part of other bodies and ends by coming to an arrangement ("union") with those of them that are sufficiently related to it: thus they then conspire together for power. And the process goes on-

637

(1885)

Even in the domain of the inorganic an atom of force is concerned only with its neighborhood: distant forces balance one another. Here is the kernel of the perspective view and why a living creature is "egoistic" through and through.

638

(1885-1886)

Supposing that the world had a certain quantum of force at its disposal, then it is obvious that every displacement of power at any point would effect the whole system-thus together with sequential causality there would be a contiguous and concurrent dependence.

639

(Spring-Fall 1887)

The sole way of maintaining a meaning for the concept "God" would be: God *not* as the driving force, but God as a maximal state, as an epoch-a point in the evolution of the will to power by means of which further evolution just as much as previous evolution up to him could be explained.
Regarded mechanistically, the energy of the totality of becoming remains constant; regarded economically, it rises to a high point and sinks down again in an eternal circle. This "will to power" expresses itself in the interpretation, in the manner in which force is used up; transformation of energy into life, and "life at its highest potency," thus appears as the goal. The same quantum of energy means different things at different stages of evolution.
That which constitutes growth in life is an ever more thrifty and more far-seeing economy, which achieves more and more with less and less force- A an ideal, the principle of the smallest expenditure-
That the world is not striving toward a stable condition is the only thing that had not been proved. Consequently one must conceive its climactic condition in such a way that it is not a condition of equilibrium-
The absolute necessity of similar events occurring in the course of one world, as in all others, is in eternity *not* a determinism ruling events, but merely the expression of the fact that the impossible is not possible; that a certain force cannot be anything other than this certain force; that it can react to a quantum of resisting force only according to the measure of its strength;-event and necessary event is a *tautology.*

2. The Will to Power as Life

A. The Organic Process

646

(1885)

There are analogies; e.g., a memory analogous to our memory that reveals itself in heredity and evolution and forms. An inventiveness in the application of tools to new ends analogous to our inventiveness and experimentation, etc.
That which we call our "consciousness" is innocent of any of the essential processes of our preservation and our growth; and no head is so subtle that it could construe more than a machine-to which every organic process is far superior.

657

(1886-1887)

What is "passive"?- To be hindered from moving forward: thus an act of resistance and reaction.
What is "active"?-reaching out for power.
"Nourishment"-is only derivative; the original phenomenon is: to desire to incorporate everything.
"Procreation"-only derivative; originally: where one will was not enough to organize the entire appropriated material, there came into force an opposing will which took in hand the separation; a new center of organization, after a struggle with the original will.
"Pleasure"-as a feeling of power (presupposing displeasure).

658

(1885)

1. The organic functions translated back to the basic will, the will to power-and understood as offshoots.
2. The will to power specializes as will to nourishment, to property, to tools, to servants (those who obey) and masters: the body as an example.- The stronger will directs the weaker. There is absolutely no other kind of causality than that of will upon will. Not explained mechanistically.
3. Thinking, feeling, willing in all living beings. What is a pleasure but: an excitation of the feeling of power by an obstacle (even more strongly by rhythmic obstacles and resistances)-so it swells up. Thus all pleasure includes pain.- If the pleasure is to be very great, the pains must be very protracted and the tension of the bow tremendous.
4. The spiritual functions. Will to shape, to assimilate, etc.

B. Man

674

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

In the tremendous multiplicity of events within an organism, the part which becomes conscious to us is a mere means: and the little bit of "virtue," "selflessness," and similar fictions are refuted radically by the total balance of events. We should study our organism in all its immorality-

The animal functions are, as a matter of principle, a million times more important than all our beautiful moods and heights of consciousness: the latter are a surplus, except when they have to serve as tools of those animal functions. The entire *conscious* life, the spirit along with the soul, the heart, goodness, and virtue-in whose service do they labor? In the service of the greatest possible perfection of the means (means of nourishment, means of enhancement) of the basic animal functions: above all, the enhancement of life.

What one used to call "body" and "flesh" is of such unspeakably great importance: the remainder is a small accessory. The task of spinning on the chain of life, and in such a way that the thread grows ever more powerful-that is the task.

But consider how heart, soul, virtue, spirit practically conspire together to subvert this systematic task-as if *they* were the end in view!- The degeneration of life is conditioned essentially by the extraordinary proneness to error of consciousness: it is held in check by instinct the least of all and therefore blunders the longest and the most thoroughly.

To measure whether existence has value according to the pleasant or unpleasant feelings aroused in this consciousness: can one think of a madder extravagance of vanity? For it is only a means-and pleasant or unpleasant feelings are also only means!

What is the objective measure of value? Solely the quantum of enhanced and organized power.

675

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

[The value of devaluing.- What I demand is] [added by Peter Gast.] that one should take the doer back into the deed after having conceptually removed the doer and thus emptied the deed; that one should take doing *something,* the "aim," the "intention," the "purpose," back into the deed after having artificially removed all this and thus emptied the deed.

All "purposes," "aims," "meaning" are only modes of expression and metamorphoses of one will that is inherent in all events: the will to power. To have purposes, aims, intentions, *willing* in general, is the same thing as willing the means to this.

The most universal and basic instinct in all doing and willing has for precisely this reason remained the least known and most hidden, because *in praxi* we always follow its commandments, because we *are* this commandment-

All valuations are only consequences and narrow perspectives in the service of this one will: valuation itself is only this will to power.

A critique of being from the point of view of any one of these values is something absurd and erroneous. Even supposing that a process of decline begins in this way, this process still stands in the service of this will.

To appraise being itself! But this appraisal itself is still this being!-and if we say no, we still do what we *are.*

One must comprehend the absurdity of this posture of judging existence, and then try to understand what is really involved in it. It is symptomatic.

677

(1883-1888)

To What Extent Interpretations of the World are Symptoms of a Ruling Drive

The *artistic* view of the world: to sit down to contemplate life. But any analysis of the aesthetic outlook is lacking: its reduction to cruelty, a feeling of security, playing the judge and standing outside, etc. One must examine the artist himself, and his psychology (critique of the drive to play as a release of force, a pleasure in change, in impressing one's soul on something foreign, the absolute egoism of the artist, etc.). What drives he sublimates.

The *scientific* view of the world: critique of the psychological need for science. The desire to make comprehensible; the desire to make practical, useful, exploitable-to what extent anti-aesthetic. Only value, what can be counted and calculated. How an average type of man seeks to gain the upper hand in this way. Dreadful when *history* is appropriated in this way-the realm of the superior, of those who judge. What drives they sublimate!

The *religious* view of the world: critique of the religious man. He is *not* necessarily the moral man, but the man of powerful exaltations and deep depressions who interprets the former with gratitude or suspicion and does not derive them from himself (-not the latter either). Essentially the man who feels himself "unfree," who sublimates his moods, his instincts of subjection.

The *moral* view of the world: The feelings of a social order of rank are projected into the universe: irremovability, law, classification and coordination, because they are valued the highest, are also sought in the highest places-above the universe or behind the universe.

What is common to all: the ruling drives want to be viewed also as the highest courts of value in general, indeed as creative and ruling powers. It is clear that these drives either oppose or subject each other (join together synthetically or alternate in dominating). Their profound antagonism is so great, however, that where they *all* seek satisfaction, a man of profound mediocrity must result.

684

(March-June 1888)

Anti-Darwin. The domestication of man: what definite value can it have? or has domestication in general any definite value?- There are grounds for denying the latter.

The school of Darwin certainly makes a great effort to convince us of the reverse: it wants to show that the effect of domestication can become profound, even fundamental. In the meantime, we stick to or old opinion: up to now, domestication has produced only quite superficial effects-when it has not produced degeneration. And everything that eludes the hand and discipline of man returns almost at once to its natural state. The type remains constant: one cannot *"dénaturer la nature."*

One counts on the struggle for existence, the death of the weaker creatures and the survival of the most robust and gifted; consequently one imagines a continual growth in perfection. We have convinced ourselves, conversely, that in the struggle for existence chance serves the weak as well as the strong; that cunning often prevails over strength; that the fruitfulness of the species stands in a notable relation to its chances of destruction-

One credits natural selection at the same time with the power of slow and endless metamorphosis; one wants to believe that every advantage is inherited and grows stronger and stronger with succeeding generations (whereas heredity is so capricious that-); one observes the fortunate adaptation of certain creatures to very special conditions of life, and one explains that these adaptations result from the influence of the milieu.

But one nowhere finds any example of *unconscious selection* (absolutely not). The most disparate individuals unite with one another, the extremes are submerged in the mass. Everything competes to preserve its type; creatures with exterior markings to protect them from danger do not lose them when they encounter conditions in which they live without danger- When they live in places in which their dress ceases to hide them they do not by any means adapt to the new milieu.

One has so exaggerated the selection of the most beautiful that it greatly exceeds the drive to beauty in our own race! In fact, the most beautiful mate with utterly disinherited creatures, and the biggest with the smallest. We almost always see males and females take advantage of any chance encounter, exhibiting no selectivity whatsoever.- Modification through food and climate-but in reality a matter of complete indifference.

There are no *transitional forms*-

Different species derived from one. Experience says that one type becomes master again.

One asserts the increasing evolution of creatures. All grounds are lacking. Every type has its limits; beyond these there is no evolution. Up to this point, absolute regularity.

Primitive creatures are said to be the ancestors of those now existing. But a look at the fauna and flora of the Tertiary merely permits us to think of an as yet unexplored country that harbors types that do not exist elsewhere, while those existing elsewhere are missing.

*

My general view.- First proposition: man as a species is not progressing. Higher types are indeed attained, but they do not last. The level of the species is *not* raised.

Second proposition: man as a species does not represent any progress compared with any other animal. The whole animal and vegetable kingdom does not evolve from the lower to the higher-but all at the same time, in utter disorder, over and against each other. The richest and most complex forms-for the expression "higher type" means no more than this-perish more easily: only the lowest preserve an apparent indestructibility. The former are achieved only rarely and maintain their superiority with difficulty; the latter are favored by a compromising fruitfulness.

Among men, too, the higher types, the lucky strokes of evolution, perish most easily as fortunes change.. They are exposed to every kind of decadence: they are extreme, and that almost means decadents.

The brief spell of beauty, of genius, of Caesar, is *sui generis:* such things are not inherited. The *type* is hereditary; a type is nothing extreme, no "lucky stroke"-

This is not due to any special fatality or malevolence of nature, but simply to the concept "higher type": the higher type represents an incomparably greater complexity-a great sum of coordinated elements: so its disintegration is also incomparably more likely. The "genius" is the sublimest machine there is-consequently the most fragile.

Third proposition: the domestication (the "culture") of man does not go deep- Where it does go deep it at once becomes degeneration (type: the Christian). The "savage" (or, in moral terms, the evil man) is a return to nature-and in a certain sense his recovery, his *cure* from "culture"-

685

(March-June 1888)

Anti-Darwin.- What surprise me most when I survey the broad destinies of man is that I always see before me the opposite of that which Darwin and his school see or *want* to see today: selection in favor of the stronger, better-constituted, and the progress of the species. Precisely the opposite is palpable: the elimination of the lucky strokes, the uselessness of the more highly developed types, the inevitable dominion of the average, even the *sub-average* types. If we are not shown why man should be an exception among creatures, I incline to the prejudice that the school of Darwin had been deluded everywhere.

The will to power in which I recognize the ultimate ground and character of all changes provides us with the reason why selection is not in favor of the exceptions and lucky strokes: the herd instincts, by the timidity of the weak, by the vast majority. My general view of the world of values shows that it is not the lucky strokes, the select types, that have the upper hand in the supreme values that are today placed over mankind; rather it is the decadent types-perhaps there is nothing in the world more interesting than this *unwelcome* spectacle-

Strange though it may sound, one always has to defend the strong against the weak; the fortunate against the unfortunate; the healthy against those degenerating and afflicted with hereditary taints. If one translates reality into a morality, this morality is: the mediocre are worth more than the exceptions; the decadent forms more than the mediocre; the will to nothingness has the upper hand over the will to life-and the overall aim is, in Christian, Buddhist, Schopenhauerian terms: "better *not* to be than to be."

I rebel against the translation of reality into a morality: therefore I abhor Christianity with a deadly hatred, because it created sublime words and gestures to throw over a horrible reality the cloak of justice, virtue, and divinity-

I see all philosophers, I see science kneeling before a reality that is the reverse of the struggle for existence as taught by Darwin's school-that is to say, I see on top and surviving everywhere those who compromise life and the value of life.- The error of the school of Darwin becomes a problem to me: how can one be so blind as to see so badly at *this* point?

That *species* represent any progress is the most unreasonable assertion in the world: so far they represent one level. That the higher organisms have evolved from the lower has not been demonstrated in a single case. I see how the lower preponderate through their numbers, their shrewdness, their cunning-I do not see how an accidental variation gives an advantage, at least not for so long a period; why an accidental change should grow so strong would be something else needing explanation.

I find teh "cruelty of nature," of which so much is said, in another place: she is cruel towards her children, she spares and protects and loves *les humbles,* just as-
In summa: growth in the *power* of a species is perhaps guaranteed less by a preponderance of its children of fortune, of strong members, than by a preponderance of average and lower types- The latter possess great fruitfulness and duration; with the former comes an increase in danger, rapid wastage, speedy reduction in numbers.

3. Theory of the Will to Power and of Values

688

(March-June 1888)

Unitary conception of psychology.- We are accustomed to consider the development of an immense abundance of forms compatible with an origin in unity.
[My theory would be:-] [Added by the German editors.] that the will to power is the primitive form of affect, that all other affects are only developments of it;
that it is notably enlightening to posit *power* in place of individual "happiness" (after which every living thing is supposed to be striving): "there is a striving for power, for an increase of power";-pleasure is only a symptom of the feeling of power attained, a consciousness of difference (-there is no striving for pleasure: but pleasure supervenes when that which is being striven for is attained: pleasure is an accompaniment, pleasure is not the motive-);
that all driving force is will to power, that there is no other physical, dynamic or psychic force except this.
In our science, where the concept of cause and effect is reduced to the relationship of equivalence, with the object of proving that the same quantum of force is present on both sides, the driving force is lacking: we observe only results, and we consider them equivalent in content and force-
It is simply a matter of experience that change never ceases: we have not the slightest inherent reason for assuming that one change must follow upon another. On the contrary: a condition once achieved would seem to be obliged to preserve itself if there were not in it a capacity for desiring not to preserve itself- Spinoza's law of "self-preservation" ought really to put a stop to change: but this law is false, the opposite is true. It can be shown most clearly that every living thing does everything it can not to preserve itself but to become *more*-

693

(March-June 1888)

If the innermost essence of being is will to power, if pleasure is every increase of power, displeasure every feeling of not being able to resist or dominate; may we not then posit pleasure and displeasure as cardinal facts? Is will possible without these two oscillations of Yes and No?- But *who* feels pleasure?- But *who* wants power?- Absurd question, if the essence itself is power-will and consequently feelings of pleasure and displeasure! Nonetheless: opposites, obstacles are needed; therefore, relatively, encroaching units-

694

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The measure of failure and fatality must grow with the resistance a force seeks to master; and as a force can expend itself only on what resists it, there is necessarily an *ingredient of displeasure* in every action. But this displeasure acts as a lure of life and strengthens the will to power!

696

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

It is *not* the satisfaction of the will that causes pleasure (I want to fight this superficial theory-the absurd psychological counterfeiting of the nearest things-), but rather the will's forward thrust and again and again becoming master over that which stands in its way. The feeling of pleasure lies precisely in the dissatisfaction of the will, in the fact that the will is never satisfied unless it has opponents and resistance.- "The happy man": a herd ideal.

697

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The normal dissatisfaction of our drives, e.g., hunger, the sexual drive, the drive to motion, contains in it absolutely nothing depressing; it works rather as an agitation of the feeling of life, as every rhythm of small, painful stimuli strengthens it, (whatever pessimists may say). This dissatisfaction, instead of making one disgusted with life, is the great stimulus to life.
(One could perhaps describe pleasure in general as a rhythm of little unpleasurable stimuli.)

699

(March-June 1888)

Pain is something different from pleasure-I mean it is *not* its opposite.
If the essence of "pleasure" has been correctly described as a feeling of more power (hence as a feeling of difference, presupposing a comparison), this does not yet furnish a definition of the essence of "displeasure." The false opposites in which the people, and *consequently* language, believes, have always been dangerous hindrances to the advance of truth. There are even cases in which a kind of pleasure is conditioned by a certain *rhythmic sequence* of little unpleasurable stimuli: in this way a very rapid increase of the feeling of power, the feeling of pleasure, is achieved. This is the case, e.g., in tickling, also the sexual tickling in the act of coitus: here we see displeasure at work as an ingredient of pleasure. It seems, a little hindrance that is overcome and immediately followed by another little hindrance that is again overcome-this game of resistance and victory arouses most strongly that general feeling of superabundant, excessive power that constitutes the essence of pleasure.
The opposite, an increase in the sensation of pain through the introduction of little pleasurable stimuli, is lacking; for pleasure and pain are not opposites.
Pain is an *intellectual* occurrence in which a definite judgment is expressed-teh judgment *"harmful,"* in which a long experience is summarized. There is no pain as such. It is not being wounded that hurts; but the experience of the bad consequences being wounded can have for the whole organism expresses itself in that profound shock that is called displeasure; (in the case of harmful influences with which former men were acquainted, e.g., those of new combinations of poisonous chemicals, pain bears no witness-and we are lost).
The really specific thing in pain is always the protracted shock, the lingering vibrations of a terrifying *choc* in the cerebral center of the nervous system:- one does not really suffer from the cause of pain (any sort of injury, for example), but from the protracted disturbance of equilibrium that occurs as a result of the *choc.* Pain is a sickness of the cerebral nerve centers-pleasure is certainly not a sickness.
That pain is the cause of reflex actions has appearance and even the prejudice of philosophers in its favor; but, if one observes it closely, in cases of sudden pain the reflex comes noticeably earlier than the sensation of pain. It would go ill with me if, when I stumbled, I had to wait for the fact to ring the bell of consciousness and for instructions how to act to be telegraphed back. What I notice with the greatest possible clarity is rather that the reflex of my foot follows first to prevent my falling, and then, at a measurable distance in time, the sudden sensation of a kind of painful wave in the front part of my head. Thus one does *not* react to the pain. Pain is subsequently projected to the wounded place-but the nature of this local pain is nonetheless not an expression of the kind of the local injury; it is a mere place-sign corresponding to the force and pitch of the injury the nerve centers have received. That as a result of this *choc* the muscular strength of the organism is measurably lowered does not warrant our seeking the *essence* of pain in a diminution of the feeling of power.
To repeat it again, one does *not* react to pain; displeasure is not a "cause" of action. Pain itself is a reaction, the reflex is another and *earlier* reaction-both originate in different places-

703

(March-June 1888)

One has confused displeasure with one *kind* of displeasure, with exhaustion; the latter does indeed represent a profound diminution and reduction of the will to power, a measurable loss of force. That is to say: there exists (a) displeasure as a means of stimulating the increase of power, and (b) displeasure following an overexpenditure of power; in the first case a stimulus, in the second the result of an excessive stimulation- Inability to resist is characteristic of the latter kind of displeasure: a challenge to that which resists belongs to the former- The only pleasure still felt in the condition of exhaustion is falling asleep; victory is the pleasure in the other case-
The great confusion on the part of psychologists consisted in not distinguishing between these two kinds of pleasure-that of falling asleep and that of victory. The exhausted want rest, relaxation, peace, calm-the happiness of the nihilistic religions and philosophies; the rich and living want victory, opponents overcome, the overflow of the feeling of power across wider domains than hitherto. All healthy functions of the organism have this need-and the whole organism is such a complex of systems struggling for an increase of the feeling of power--

III. The Will to Power as Society and Individual

1. Society and State

2. The Individual

781

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Preoccupation with itself and its "eternal salvation" is not the expression of a rich and self-confident type; for that type does not give a damn about its salvation-it has no such interest in happiness of any kind; it is force, deed, desire-it imposes itself upon things, it lays violent hands on things. Christianity is a romantic hypochondria of those whose legs are shaky.
Wherever the hedonistic perspective comes into the foreground one may infer suffering and a type that represents a failure.

IV. The Will to Power as Art

800

(March-June 1888)

The feeling of intoxication, in fact corresponding to an increase in strength; strongest in the mating season: new organs, new accomplishments, colors, forms; "becoming more beautiful" is a consequence of *enhanced* strength. Becoming more beautiful as the expression of a *victorious* will, of increased coordination, of a harmonizing of all the strong desires, of an infallibly perpendicular stress. Logical and geometrical simplification is a consequence of enhancement of strength: conversely the apprehension of such a simplification again enhances the feeling of strength- High point of the development: the grand style.
Ugliness signifies the decadence of a type, contradiction and lack of coordination between the inner- signifies a decline in organizing strength, in "will," to speak psychologically.
The condition of pleasure called intoxication is precisely an exalted feeling of *power*- The sensations of space and time are altered: tremendous distances are surveyed and, as it were, for the first time apprehended; the extension of vision over greater masses and expanses; the refinement of the organs for the apprehension of much that is extremely small and fleeting; *divination,* the power of understanding with only the least assistance, at the slightest suggestion: "intelligent" *sensuality*-; strength as a feeling of dominion in the muscles, as suppleness and pleasure in movement, as dance, as levity and *presto;* strength as pleasure in the proof of strength, as bravado, adventure, fearlessness, indifference to life or death- All these climactic moments of life mutually stimulate one another; the world of images and ideas of the one suffices as a suggestion for the others:-in this way, states finally merge into one another though they might perhaps have good reason to remain apart. For example: the feeling of religious intoxication and sexual excitation (-two profound feelings, coordinated to an almost amazing degree. What pleases all pious women, old or young? Answer: a saint with beautiful legs, still young, still an idiot). Cruelty in tragedy and sympathy (-also normally coordinated-). Spring, dance, music:-all competitions between the sexes-and even that Faustian "infinity in the breast."
Artists, if they are any good, are (physically as well) strong, full of surplus energy, powerful animals, sensual; without a certain overheating of the sexual system a Raphael is unthinkable- Making music is another way of making children; chastity is merely the economy of an artist-and in any event, even with artists fruitfulness ceases when potency ceases- Artists should see nothing as it is, but fuller, simpler, stronger: to that end, their lives must contain a kind of youth and spring, a kind of habitual intoxication.

811

(March-June 1888)

It is exceptional states that condition the artist-all of them profoundly related to and interlaced with morbid phenomena-so it seems impossible to me to be an artist and not to be sick.
Physiological states that are in the artist as it were molded into a "personality" and that characterize men in general to some degree:
1. *intoxication:* the feeling of an enhanced power; the inner need to make of things a reflex of one's own fullness and perfection;
2. the *extreme sharpness* of certain senses, so they understand a quite different sign language-and create one-the condition that seems to be a part of many nervous disorders-; extreme mobility that turns into an extreme urge to communicate; the desire to speak on the part of everything that knows how to make signs-; a need to get rid of oneself, as it were, through signs and gestures; ability to speak of oneself through a hundred speech media-an *explosive* condition. One must first think of this condition as a compulsion and urge to get rid of the exuberance of inner tension through muscular activity and movements of all kinds; then as an involuntary coordination between this movement and the processes within (images, thoughts, desires)-as a kind of automatism of the whole muscular system impelled by strong stimuli from within-; inability to prevent reaction; the system of inhibitions suspended, as it were. Every inner movement (feeling, thought, affect) is accompanied by vascular changes and consequently by changes in color, temperature, and secretion. The suggestive power of music, its *"suggestion mentale";-*

3. the *compulsion to imitate:* an extreme irritability through which a given example becomes contagious-a state is divined on the basis of signs and immediately enacted- An image, rising up within, immediately turns into a movement of the limbs-a certain suspension of the will-(Schopenhauer!!!) A kind of deafness and blindness towards the external world-the realm of admitted stimuli is sharply defined.

This is what distinguishes the artist from laymen (those susceptible to art): the latter reach the high point of their susceptibility when they receive; the former as they give-so that an antagonism between these two gifts is not only natural but desirable. The perspectives of these two states are opposite: to demand of the artist that he should practice the perspective of the audience (of the critic-) means to demand that he should impoverish himself and his creative power- It is the same here as with the difference between the sexes: one ought not to demand of the artist, who gives, that he should become a woman-that he should receive.

Our aesthetics hitherto has been a woman's aesthetics to the extent that only the receivers of art have formulated their experience of "what is beautiful?" In all philosophy hitherto the artist is lacking-

This, as the foregoing indicates, is a necessary mistake; for the artist who began to understand himself would misunderstand himself: he ought not to look back, he ought not to look at all, he ought to give.-

It is to the honor of an artist if he is unable to be a critic-otherwise he is half-and-half, he is "modern."

822

(1888)

If my readers are sufficiently initiated into the idea that "the good man" represents, in the total drama of life, a form of *exhaustion,* they will respect the consistency of Christianity in conceiving the good man as ugly. Christianity was right in this.

For a philosopher to say, "the good and the beautiful are one," is infamy; if he goes on to add, "also the true," one ought to thrash him. Truth is ugly.

We possess *art* lest we *perish of the truth.*

849

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

Future things.- Against the romanticism of great "passion."- To grasp that a quantum of coldness, lucidity, hardness is part of all "classical" taste: logic above all, happiness in spirituality, "three unities," concentration, hatred for feeling, heart, *esprit,* hatred for the manifold, uncertain, rambling, for intimations, as well as for the brief, pointed, pretty, good-natured. One should not play with artistic formulas: one should remodel life so that afterward it *has* to formulate itself.

It is an amusing comedy at which we have only now learned to laugh, which we only now *see:* that the contemporaries of Herder, Winckelmann, Goethe, and Hegel claimed to have *rediscovered the classical ideal*-and at the same time Shakespeare!- And the same generation had meanly repudiated the French classical school! as if the essential things could not have been learned here as well as there!- But one desired "nature," "naturalness": oh stupidity! One believed that classicism was a kind of naturalness!

To think through, without prejudice or indulgence, in what soil a classical taste can grow. Hardening, simplification, strengthening, making man mire evil: these belong together. Logical-psychological simplification. Contempt for detail, complexity, the uncertain.

The romantics in Germany do *not* protest against classicism, but against reason, enlightenment, taste, the eighteenth century.

The sensibility of romantic-Wagnerian music: antithesis of *classical sensibility.*

The will to unity (because unity tyrannizes-namely over the listener, spectator); but inability to tyrannize over oneself concerning the main thing-namely in regard to work itself (omitting, shortening, clarifying, simplifying). Overwhelming through masses (Wagner, Victor Hugo, Zola, Taine).

BOOK IV
DISCIPLINE AND BREEDING
I. Order of Rank
1. The Doctrine of Order of Rank

858

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

What determines your rank is the quantum of power you are: the rest is cowardice.

862

(1884)

A doctrine is needed powerful enough to work as a breeding agent: strengthening the strong, paralyzing and destructive for the world-weary.
The annihilation of the decaying races. Decay of Europe.- The annihilation of slavish evaluations.- Dominion over the earth as a means of producing a higher type.- The annihilation of the tartuffery called "morality" (Christianity as a hysterical kind of honesty in this: Augustine, Bunyan).- The annihilation of *suffrage universel;* i.e., the system through which the lowest natures prescribe themselves as laws for the higher.- The annihilation of mediocrity and its acceptance. (The one-sided, individuals-peoples; to strive for fullness of nature through the pairing of opposites: race mixture to this end).- The new courage-no *a priori* truths (such truths were sought by those accustomed to faith!), but a *free* subordination to a ruling idea that has its time: e.g., time as a property of space, etc.

2. The Strong and the Weak

871

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

The victorious and unbridled: their depressive influence on the value of the desires. It was the dreadful barbarism of custom that, especially in the Middle Ages, compelled the creation of a veritable "league of virtue"- together with an equally dreadful exaggeration of that which constitutes the value of man. Struggling "civilization" (taming) needs every kind of irons and torture to maintain itself against terribleness and beast-of-prey natures.
Here a confusion is quite natural, although its influence has been fatal: that which men of power and will are able to demand of themselves also provides a measure of that which they may permit themselves. Such natures are the antithesis of the vicious and unbridled: although they may on occasion do things that would convict a lesser man of vice and immoderation.
Here the concept of the "equal value of men before God" is extraordinarily harmful; one forbade actions and attitudes that were in themselves among the prerogatives of the strongly constituted-as if they were in themselves unworthy of men. One brought the entire tendency of the strong into disrepute when one erected the protective measures of the weakest (those who were weakest also when confronting themselves) as a norm of value.
Confusion went so far that one branded the very virtuosi of life (whose autonomy offered the sharpest antithesis to the vicious and unbridled) with the most opprobrious names. Even now one believes one must disapprove of a Cesare Borgia; that is simply laughable. The church has excommunicated German emperors on account of their vices: as if a monk or priest had any right to join in a discussion about what a Frederick II may demand of himself. A Don Juan is sent to hell: that is very naive. Has it been noticed that in heaven all interesting men are missing?- Just a hint to the girls as to where they can best find their salvation.- If one reflects with some consistency, and moreover with a deepened insight into what a "great man" is, no doubt remains that the church sends all "great men" to hell-it fights *against* all "greatness of man."

877

(Spring-Fall 1887; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

The revolution made Napoleon possible: that is its justification. For the sake of a similar prize one would have to desire the anarchical collapse of our entire civilization. Napoleon made nationalism possible: that is its excuse.
The value of a man (apart from his morality or immorality, naturally; for with these concepts the value of a man is not even touched) does not reside in his utility; for it would continue to exist even if there were no one to whom he could be of any use. And why could not precisely that man who produced the most disastrous effects be the pinnacle of the whole species of man: so high, so superior that everything would perish from envy of him?

893

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Hatred of mediocrity is unworthy of a philosopher: it is almost a question mark against his *"right* to philosophy." Precisely because he is an exception he has to take the rule under his protection, he has to keep the mediocre in good heart.

898

(Spring-Fall 1887)

The strong of the future.- That which partly necessity, partly chance has achieved here and there, the conditions for the production of a stronger type, we are now able to comprehend and consciously will: we are able to create the conditions under which such an elevation is possible.
Until now, "education" has had in view the needs of society: not the possible needs of the future, but the needs of the society of the day. One desired to produce "tools" for it. Assuming the wealth of force were greater, one could imagine forces being subtracted, not to serve the needs of society but some future need.

Such a task would have to be posed the more it was grasped to what extent the contemporary form of society was being so powerfully transformed that at some future time it would be unable to exist for its own sake alone, but only as a tool in the hands of a stronger race.
The increasing dwarfing of man is precisely the driving force that brings to mind the breeding of a stronger race-a race that would be excessive precisely where the dwarfed species was weak and growing weaker (in will, responsibility, self-assurance, ability to posit goals for oneself).
The means would be those history teaches: isolation through interests in preservation that are the reverse of those which are average today; habituation to reverse evaluations; distance as a pathos; a free conscience in those things that today are most undervalued and prohibited.
The homogenizing of European man is the great process that cannot be obstructed: one should even hasten it. The necessity to create a gulf, distance, order of rank, is given *eo ipso-not* the necessity to retard the process.
As soon as it is established, this homogenizing species requires a justification: it lies in serving a higher sovereign species that stands upon the former and can raise itself to its task only by doing this. Not merely a master race whose sole task is to rule, but a race with its own sphere of life, with an excess of strength for beauty, bravery, culture, manners to the highest peak of the spirit; an affirming race that may grant itself every great luxury-strong enough to have no need of the tyranny of the virtue-imperative, rich enough to have no need of thrift and pedantry, beyond good and evil; a hothouse for strange and choice plants.

899

(1885)

Our psychologists, whose glance lingers involuntarily on symptoms of decadence alone, again and again induce us to mistrust the spirit. One always sees only those effects of the spirit that make men weak, delicate, and morbid; but now there are coming

new barbarians { cynics experimenters conquerors } union of spiritual superiority with well-being and an excess of strength.**900**

(1885)

I point to something new: certainly for such a democratic type there exists the danger of the barbarian, but one has looked for it only in the depths. There exists also another type of barbarian, who comes from the heights: a species of conquering and ruling natures in search of material to mold. Prometheus was this kind of barbarian.

909

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

The typical forms of self-formation. Or: the eight principal questions.

1. Whether one wants to be more multifarious or simpler?
2. Whether one wants to become happier or more indifferent to happiness and unhappiness?
3. Whether one wants to become more contented with oneself or more exacting and inexorable?
4. Whether one wants to become softer, more yielding, more human, or more "inhuman"?
5. Whether one wants to become more prudent or more ruthless?
6. Whether one wants to reach a goal or to avoid all goals (as, e.g., the philosopher does who smells a boundary, a nook, a prison, a stupidity in every goal)?
7. Whether one wants to become more respected or more feared? Or more despised?
8. Whether one wants to become tyrant or seducer or shepherd or herd animal?

910

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Types of my disciples.- To those human beings who are of any concern to me I wish suffering, desolation, sickness, ill-treatment, indignities-I wish that they should not remain unfamiliar with profound self-contempt, the torture of self-mistrust, the wretchedness of the vanquished: I have no pity for them, because I wish them the only thing that can prove today whether one is worth anything or not-that one endures. [The note continues in Nietzsche's MS: "I have not yet got to know any idealist, but many liars--"]

916

(1884; rev. Spring-Fall 1888)

What has been ruined by the church's misuse of it:
1. *asceticism:* one has hardly the courage so far to display its natural utility, its indispensability in the service of the education of the will. Our absurd pedagogic world, before which the "useful civil servant" hovers as a model, thinks it can get by with "instruction," with brain drill; it has not the slightest idea that something else is needed *first*-education of will power; one devises tests for everything except for the main thing: whether one can will,

whether one may promise; the young man finishes school without a single question, without any curiosity even, concerning this supreme value-problem of his nature;
2. *fasting:* in every sense-even as a means of preserving the delicacy of one's ability to enjoy all good things (e.g., occasionally to stop reading, listening to music, being pleasant; one must have fast days for one's virtues, too);
3. the *"monastery":* temporary isolation, accompanied by strict refusal, e.g., of letters; a kind of most profound self-reflection and self-recovery that desires to avoid, not "temptations," but "duties": an escape from the daily round; a detachment from they tyranny of stimuli and influences that condemns us to spend our strength in nothing but reactions and does not permit the accumulation to the point of *spontaneous activity* (one should observe our scholars from close up: they think only *reactively;* i.e., they have to read before they can think);
4. *feasts:* One has to be very coarse in order not to feel the presence of Christians and Christian values as an oppression beneath which all genuine festive feelings go to the devil. Feasts include: pride, exuberance, wantonness; mockery of everything serious and Philistine; a divine affirmation of oneself out of animal plenitude and perfection-one and all states which the Christian cannot honestly welcome. The feast is paganism *par excellence;*
5. *courage confronted with one's own nature: dressing up in "moral costumes.*- That one has no need of moral formulas in order to welcome an affect; standard: how far we can affirm what is nature in us-how much or how little we need to have recourse to morality;
6. *death*- One must convert the stupid physiological fact into a moral necessity. So to live that one can also *will at the right time to die!*

918

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

One would make a fit little boy stare if one asked him: "Would you like to become virtuous?"- but he will open his eyes wide if asked: "Would you like to become stronger than your friends?"-

3. The Noble Man

941

(Summer-Fall 1883)

The meaning of our gardens and palaces (and to this extent also the meaning of all desire for riches) is to remove disorder and vulgarity from sight and to build a home for nobility of soul.
The majority, to be sure, believe they will acquire higher natures when, those beautiful, peaceful objects have operated upon them: hence the rush to go to Italy and on travels, etc.; all reading and visits to theaters. They want to have themselves formed-that is the meaning of their cultural activity! But the strong, the mighty want to form and no longer to have anything foreign about them!
Thus men also plunge into wild nature, not to find themselves but to lose and forget themselves in it. "To be outside oneself" as the desire of all the weak and the self-discontented.

942

(1885)

There is only nobility of birth, only nobility of blood. (I am not speaking here of the little word *"von"* or of the Almanach de Gotha [Genealogy reference book of the royal families of Europe.]: parenthesis for asses.) When one speaks of "aristocrats of the spirit," reasons are usually not lacking for concealing something; as is well known, it is a favorite term among ambitious Jews. For spirit alone does not make noble; rather, there must be something to ennoble the spirit.- What then is required? Blood.

949

(Nov. 1887-March 1888)

That one stakes one's life, one's health, one's honor, is the consequence of high spirits and an overflowing, prodigal will: not from love of man but because every great danger challenges our curiosity about the degree of our strength and our courage.

4. The Masters of the Earth

958

(1884)

I write for a species of man that does not yet exist: for the "masters of the earth."
Religions, as consolations and relaxations, dangerous: man believes he has a right to take his ease.
In Plato's *Theages* it is written: "Each one of us would like to be master over all men, if possible, and best of all God." This attitude must exist again.
Englishmen, Americans, and Russians--

960

(1885-1886)

From now on there will be more favorable preconditions for more comprehensive forms of dominion, whose like has never yet existed. And even this is not the most important thing; the possibility has been established for the production of international racial unions whose task will be to rear a master race, the future "masters of the earth";-a new, tremendous aristocracy, based on the severest self-legislation, in which the will of philosophical men of power and artist-tyrants will be made to endure for millennia-a higher kind of man who, thanks to their superiority in will, knowledge, riches, and influence, employ democratic Europe as their most pliant and supple instrument for getting hold of the destinies of the earth, so as to work as artists upon "man" himself. Enough: the time is coming when politics will have a different meaning.

5. The Great Human Being

966

(1884)

In contrast to the animals, man has cultivated an abundance of *contrary* drives and impulses within himself: thanks to this synthesis, he is master of the earth.- Moralities are the expression of locally limited orders of rank in his multifarious world of drives, so man should not perish through their contradictions. Thus a drive as master, its opposite weakened, refined, as the impulse that provides the stimulus for the activity of the chief drive.

The highest man would have the greatest multiplicity of drives, in the relatively greatest strength that can be endured. Indeed, where the plant "man" shows himself strongest one finds instincts that conflict powerfully (e.g., in Shakespeare), but are controlled.

6. The Highest Man as Legislator of the Future

981

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Not to make men "better," *not* to preach morality to them in any form, as if "morality in itself," or any ideal kind of man, were given; but to *create conditions* that *require stronger men* who for their part need, and consequently will *have,* a morality (more clearly: a physical-spiritual discipline) *that makes them strong!*

Not to allow oneself to be misled by blue eyes or heaving bosoms: *greatness of soul has nothing romantic about it.* And unfortunately nothing at all amiable.

984

(1884)

Greatness of soul is inseparable from greatness of spirit. For it involves *independence;* but in the absence of spiritual greatness, independence ought not to be allowed, it causes mischief, even through its desire to do good and practice "justice." Small spirits must *obey*-hence cannot possess *greatness.*

II. Dionysus

1003

(Jan.-Fall 1888)

To him who has turned out well, who does my heart good, carved from wood that is hard, gentle, and fragrant-in whom even the nose takes pleasure-this book is dedicated.

He enjoys the taste of what is wholesome for him;

his pleasure in anything ceases when the bounds of the wholesome are crossed;

he divines the remedies for partial injuries; he has illnesses as great stimulants of his life;

he knows how to exploit ill chances;

he grows stronger through the accidents that threaten to destroy him;

he instinctively gathers from all that he sees, hears, experiences, what advances his main concern-he follows a principle of selection-he allows much to fall through;

he reacts with the slowness bred by a long caution and a deliberate pride-he tests a stimulus for its origin and its intentions, he does not submit;

he is always in his *own* company, whether he deals with books, men, or landscapes;

he honors by choosing, by admitting, by trusting.

1007

(Spring-Fall 1887)

To revalue values-what would that mean? All the spontaneous-new, future, stronger-movements must be there; but they still appear under false names and valuations and have not yet become conscious of themselves.

A courageous becoming-conscious and affirmation of what has been achieved-a liberation from the slovenly routine of old valuations that dishonor us in the best and strongest things we have achieved.

1017

(Spring-Fall 1887)

In place of the "natural man" of Rousseau, the nineteenth century has discovered a *truer image of* "man"-it has had the *courage* to do so.- On the whole, the Christian concept "man" has thus been reinstated. What one has *not* had the courage for is to call *this* "man in himself" good and to see in him the guarantee of the future. Neither has one dared to grasp that an increase in the terribleness of man is an accompaniment of every increase in culture; in this, one is still subject to the Christian ideal and takes *its* side against paganism, also against the Renaissance concept of *virtù.* But the key to culture is not to be found in this way: and *in praxis* one retains the falsification of history in favor of the "good man" (as if he alone constituted the progress of man) and the socialist ideal (i.e., the residue of Christianity and of Rousseau in the de-Christianized world).
The struggle against the eighteenth century: its supreme overcoming by Goethe and Napoleon. Schopenhauer, too, struggles against it; but he involuntarily steps back into the seventeenth century-he is a modern Pascal, with Pascalian value judgments *without* Christianity. Schopenhauer was not strong enough for a new Yes.
Napoleon: insight that the higher and the terrible man necessarily belong together. The "man" reinstated; the woman again accorded her due tribute of contempt and fear. "Totality" as health and highest activity; the straight line, the grand style in action rediscovered; the most powerful instinct, that of life itself, the lust to rule, affirmed.

1023

(March-June 1888)

Pleasure appears where there is the feeling of power.
Happiness: in the triumphant consciousness of power and victory.
Progress: the strengthening of the type, the ability for great willing; everything else is misunderstanding, danger.

1026

(Summer-Fall 1883)

Not "happiness follows virtue"-but the more powerful man first designates his happy state as virtue.
Evil actions belong to the powerful and virtuous: bad, base ones to the subjected.
The most powerful man, the creator, would have to be the most evil, in as much as he carries his ideal against the ideals of other men and remakes them in his own image. Evil here means: hard, painful, enforced.
Such men as Napoleon must come again and again and confirm the belief in the autocracy of the individual: but he himself was corrupted by the means he *had to* employ and lost *noblesse* of character. If he had had to prevail among a different kind of man he could have employed other means; and it would thus not seem to be a necessity for a *Caesar* to become bad.

1028

(Spring-Fall 1887)

Terribleness is part of greatness: let us not deceive ourselves.

1038

(March-Fall 1888)

-And how many new gods are still possible! As for myself, in whom the religious, that is to say god-forming, instinct occasionally becomes active at impossible times-how differently, how variously the divine has revealed itself to me each time!
So many strange things have passed before me in those timeless moments that fall into one's life as if from the moon, when one no longer has any idea how old one is or how young one will yet be-I should not doubt that there are many kinds of gods- There are some one cannot imagine without a certain halcyon and frivolous quality in their makeup- Perhaps light feet are even an integral part of the concept :god- Is it necessary to elaborate that a god prefers to stay beyond everything bourgeois and rational? and, between ourselves, also beyond good and evil? His prospect of *free*-in Goethe's words.- And to call upon the inestimable authority of Zarathustra in this instance: Zarathustra goes so far as to confess: "I would believe only in a God who could *dance"*-
To repeat: how many new gods are still possible! Zarathustra himself, to be sure, is merely an old atheist: he believes neither in old nor in new gods. Zarathustra says he *would;* but Zarathustra *will* not- Do not misunderstand him.
The type of God after the type of creative spirits, of "great men."

1049

(1885-1886)

Apollo's deception: the *eternity* of beautiful forms; the aristocratic legislation, *"thus shall it be for ever!"*
Dionysus: sensuality and cruelty. Transitoriness could be interpreted as enjoyment of productive and destructive force, as *continual creation.*

BOOK IV (Cont'd.)
DISCIPLINE AND BREEDING

III. The Eternal Recurrence

1053 (1884)

My philosophy brings the triumphant idea of which all other modes of thought will ultimately perish. It is the great cultivating idea: the races that cannot bear it stand condemned; those who find it the greatest benefit are chosen to rule.

1054 (1885-1886)

The *greatest* of struggles: for this a new weapon is needed.
The hammer: to provoke a fearful decision, to confront Europe with the consequences: whether its will "wills" destruction.
Prevention of reduction to mediocrity. Rather destruction!

1055 (1885)

A pessimistic teaching and way of thinking, an ecstatic nihilism, can under certain conditions be indispensable precisely to the philosopher-as a mighty pressure and hammer with which he breaks and removes degenerate and decaying races to make way for a new order of life, or to implant into that which is degenerate and desires to die a longing for the end.

1056 (1884)

I want to teach the idea that gives many the right to erase themselves-the great *cultivating* idea.

1057 (1883-1888)

The eternal recurrence. A prophecy. [In the MS: "A Book of Prophecy." In the so-called Grossoktav edition of 1911, p. 514, this section represents the plan for a book, *The Eternal Recurrence*.]
1. Presentation of the doctrine and its *theoretical* presuppositions and consequences.
2. Proof of the doctrine.
3. Probable consequences of its being *believed* (it makes everything *break open).*
a) Means of enduring it;
b) Means of disposing it.
4. Its place in history as a *mid-point.*
Period of greatest danger.
Foundation of an oligarchy *above* peoples and their interests: education to a universally human politics.
Counterpart of Jesuitism.

1058 (1883-1888)

The two great philosophical points of view (devised by Germans):
a) that of *becoming,* of *development.*
b) that according to the *value of existence* (but the wretched form of German pessimism must first be overcome!)-both brought together by me in a *decisive* way.
Everything becomes and recurs eternally-escape is impossible!- Supposing we *could* judge value, what follows? The idea of recurrence as a *selective* principle, in the service of strength (and barbarism!!).
Ripeness of man for this idea.

1059 (1884)

1. The idea [of the eternal recurrence]: the presuppositions that would have to be true if it were true. Its consequences.
2. As the *hardest* idea: its probable effect if it were not prevented, i.e., if all values were not revalued.
3. Means of *enduring it:* the revaluation of all values. No longer joy in certainty but uncertainty; no longer "cause and effect" but the continually creative; no longer will to preservation but to power; no longer the humble expression, "everything is *merely* subjective," but "it is also *our* work!- Let us be proud of it!"

1060 (1884)

To *endure* the idea of the recurrence one needs: freedom from morality; new means against the fact of *pain* (pain conceived as a tool, as the father of pleasure; there is no cumulative consciousness of displeasure); the enjoyment of all kinds of uncertainty, experimentalism, as a counterweight to this extreme fatalism; abolition of the concept of necessity; abolition of the "will"; abolition of "knowledge-in-itself."
Greatest elevation of the consciousness of strength in man, as he creates the overman.

1061 (1887-1888)

The two most extreme modes of thought-the mechanistic and the Platonic-are reconciled in the *eternal recurrence:* both as ideals.

1062 (1885)

If the world had a goal, it must have been reached. If there were for it some unintended final state, this also must have been reached. If it were in any way capable of a pausing and becoming fixed, of "being,"

then all becoming would long since have come to an end, along with all thinking, all "spirit." The fact of "spirit" as a form of becoming proves that the world has no goal, no final state, and is incapable of being. The old habit, however, of associating a goal with every event and a guiding, creative God with the world, is so powerful that it requires an effort for a thinker not to fall into thinking of the very aimlessness of the world as intended. This notion-that the world intentionally avoids a goal and even knows artifices for keeping itself from entering into a circular course-must occur to all those who would like to force on the world the ability for *eternal novelty,* i.e., on a finite, definite, unchangeable force of constant size, such as the world is, the miraculous power of infinite novelty in its forms and states. The world, even if it is no longer a god, is still supposed to be capable of the divine power of creation, the power of infinite transformations; it is supposed to consciously prevent itself from returning to any of its old forms; it is supposed to possess not only the intention but the *means* of every one of its movements at every moment so as to escape goals, final states, repetitions-and whatever else may follow from such an unforgivably insane way of thinking and desiring. It is still the old religious way of thinking and desiring, a kind of longing to believe that *in some way* the world is after all like the old beloved, infinite, boundlessly creative God-that in some way "the old God still lives"-that longing of Spinoza which was expressed in the words *"deus sive natura"* [God or nature.] (he even felt *"natura sive deus"*).

What, then, is the law and belief with which the decisive change, the recently attained preponderance of the scientific spirit over the religious, God-inventing spirit, is most clearly formulated? Is it not: the world, as force, may not be thought of as unlimited, for it *cannot* be so thought of; we forbid ourselves the concept of an infinite force as incompatible with the concept "force." Thus-the world also lacks the capacity for eternal novelty.

1063 (1887-1888)

The law of the conservation of energy demands *eternal recurrence.*

1064 (1885)

That a state of equilibrium is never reached proves that it is not possible. But in an indefinite space it would have to have been reached. Likewise in a spherical space. The *shape* of space must be the cause of eternal movement, and ultimately of all "imperfection."

That "force" and "rest," "remaining the same," contradict one another. The measure of force (as magnitude) as fixed, but its essence in flux. [The MS continues: "in tension, compelling."]

"Timelessness" to be rejected. At any precise moment of a force, the absolute conditionality of a new distribution of all its forces is given: it cannot stand still. "Change" belongs to the essence, therefore also temporality: with this, however, the necessity of change has only been posited once more conceptually.

1065 (Nov. 1887-March 1888)

A certain emperor always bore in mind the transitoriness of all things so as not to take them too seriously and to live at peace among them. To me, on the contrary, everything seems far too valuable to be so fleeting: I seek an eternity for everything: ought one to pour the most precious salves and wines into the sea?- My consolation is that everything that has been is eternal: the sea will cast it up again.

1066 (March-June 1888)

The new world-conception.- The world exists; it is not something that becomes, not something that passes away. Or rather: it becomes, it passes away, but it has never begun to become and never ceased from passing away-it maintains itself in both.- It lives on itself: its excrements are its food.

We need not worry for a moment about the hypothesis of a *created* world. The concept "create" is today completely indefinable [This word is illegible.], unrealizable; merely a word, a rudimentary survival from the ages of superstition; one can explain nothing with a mere word. The last attempt to conceive a world that had a beginning has lately been made several times with the aid of logical procedures-generally, as one may divine, with an ulterior theological motive.

Lately one has sought several times to find a contradiction in the concept "temporal infinity of the world in the past" *(regressus in infinitum):* one has even found it, although at the cost of confusing the head with the tail. Nothing can prevent me from reckoning backward from this moment and saying "I shall never reach the end"; just as I can reckon forward from the same moment into the infinite. Only if I made the mistake-I shall guard against it-of equating this correct concept of a *regressus in infinitum* with an utterly unrealizable concept of a finite *progressus* up to this present, only if I suppose that the direction (forward or backward) is logically a matter of indifference, would I take the head-this moment-for the tail: I shall leave that to you, my dear Herr Dühring!-

I have come across this idea in earlier thinkers: every time it was determined by other ulterior considerations (-mostly theological, in favor of the *creator spiritus).* If the world could in any way become rigid, dry, dead, *nothing,* or if it could reach a state of equilibrium, or if it had any kind of goal that

involved duration, immutability, the once-and-for-all (in short, speaking metaphysically: if becoming *could* resolve itself into being or into nothingness), then this state must have been reached: from which it follows-

This is the sole certainty we have in our hands to serve as a corrective to a great host of world hypotheses possible in themselves. If, e.g., the mechanistic theory cannot avoid the consequence, drawn for it by William Thomson [First Baron Kelvin (1824-1907), British physicist and mathematician who introduced the Kelvin or Absolute Scale of temperature.], of leading to a final state, then the mechanistic theory stands refuted.

If the world may be thought of as a certain definite quantity of force and as a certain definite number of centers of force-and every other representation remains indefinite and therefore useless-it follows that, in the great dice game of existence, it must pass through a calculable number of combinations. In infinite time, every possible combination would at some time or another be realized; more: it would be realized an infinite number of times. And since between every combination and its next recurrence all other possible combinations would have to take place, and each of these combinations conditions the entire sequence of combinations in the same series, a circular movement of absolutely identical series is thus demonstrated: the world as a circular movement that has already repeated itself infinitely often and plays its game *in infinitum.*

This conception is not simply a mechanistic conception; for if it were that, it would not condition an infinite recurrence of identical cases, but a final state. *Because* the world has not reached this, mechanistic theory must be considered an imperfect and merely provisional hypothesis.

1067 (1885)

And do you know what "the world" is to me? Shall I show it to you in my mirror? This world: a monster of energy, without beginning, without end; a firm, iron magnitude of force that does not grow bigger or smaller, that does not expend itself but only transforms itself; as a whole, of unalterable size, a household without expenses or losses, but likewise without increase or income; enclosed by "nothingness" as by a boundary; not something blurry or wasted, not something endlessly extended, but set in a definite space as a definite force, and not a sphere that might be "empty" here or there, but rather as force throughout, as a play of forces and waves of forces, at the same time one and many, increasing here and at the same time decreasing there; a sea of forces flowing and rushing together, eternally changing, eternally flooding back, with tremendous years of recurrence, with an ebb and a flood of its forms; out of the simplest forms striving toward the most complex, out of the stillest, most rigid, coldest forms toward the hottest, most turbulent, most self-contradictory, and then again returning home to the simple out of this abundance, out of the play of contradictions back to the joy of concord, still affirming itself in this uniformity of its courses and its years, blessing itself as that which must return eternally, as a becoming that knows no satiety, no disgust, no weariness: this, my *Dionysian* world of the eternally self-creating, the eternally self-destroying, this mystery world of the twofold voluptuous delight, my "beyond good and evil," without goal, unless the joy of the circle is itself a goal; without will, unless a ring feels good will toward itself-do you want a *name* for this world? A *solution* for all its riddles? A *light* for you, too, you best-concealed, strongest, most intrepid, most midnightly men?- *This world is the will to power-and nothing besides!* And you yourselves are also this will to power-and nothing besides!